DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 039 UD 026 155

AUTHOR Reyes, Lilia M.; Waxman, Laura DeKoven
TITLE The Continuing Growth of Hunger, Homelessness, and Poverty in America's Cities: 1987. A 26-City Survey.
INSTITUTION United States Conference of Mayors, Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE Dec 87
NOTE 84p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Emergency Programs; Employment Problems; *Homeless People; *Housing Needs; Human Services; *Hunger; Low Income Groups; Low Rent Housing; Population Trends; *Poverty; Unemployment; *Urban Areas; Urban Demography; Urban Population; *Urban Problems

ABSTRACT

This survey assesses the status of hunger, homelessness, and poverty in cities in the United States during 1987. The findings include the following: (1) the number of the homeless and the poor had increased and was expected to continue to increase; (2) the demand for emergency food assistance and emergency shelter assistance had increased and was expected to increase; (3) emergency food and shelter facilities must turn away some of those in need due to lack of resources; (4) the causes of hunger were unemployment, inadequate income assistance levels, and poverty; (5) the causes of homelessness were the lack of affordable low-income housing, mental illness, and unemployment; (6) every city used local funds and state or Federal grants to support programs for the hungry and the homeless; (7) the demand by low-income households for housing assistance increased; (8) assisted housing programs were serving one-third of the eligible low-income families; (9) none of the survey cities expected to be able to meet the housing needs of low-income households in the future due to declining Federal assistance; (10) unemployment either decreased or remained constant, but those figures did not reflect discouraged workers; and (11) while 64 percent of the cities reported that they had benefited from the national economic recovery, 81 percent said that the economic recovery had not helped hungry, homeless, or other poor people. Statistical tables, a copy of the survey questionnaire, and comments from respondents are included. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297039

THE CONTINUING GROWTH OF HUNGER, HOMELESSNESS AND POVERTY IN AMERICA'S CITIES: 1987

A 26-CITY SURVEY

DECEMBER, 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Laura D. Wadman
U.S. Conference of Mayors
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UNITED STATES
CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

UD026155

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Mayor Richard L. Berkley, President
Mayor of Kansas City, MO

Mayor Raymond L. Flynn, Chair
Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness
Mayor of Boston

J. Thomas Cochran, Executive Director

This report was written by Lilia M. Reyes and Laura DeKoven Waxman of the U.S. Conference of Mayors' staff. Additional copies are available for $10 each from Elynor Humber, U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1620 Eye Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006, (202)293-7330.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION

LETTER FROM MAYOR RAYMOND L. FLYNN

SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION 5

HUNGER 7

HOMELESSNESS 21

HOUSING 43

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS 47

APPENDIX 63

- Characteristics of Survey Cities
- Selected Locally-Designed Housing Innovations to Assist Low-Income People
- Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness Information Sheet
- Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness

This Report is Dedicated
to the Memory of

Harold Washington

The 42*nd* Mayor of the City of Chicago

His untiring efforts on behalf of the hungry, the homeless and the poor must not be forgotten and shall serve as an inspiration to all who work to improve the lives of the disadvantaged citizens of our cities.

CITY OF BOSTON • MASSACHUSETTS

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
RAYMOND L. FLYNN

December 1987

Dear Friend:

I am both pleased and distressed to present the latest report of the U.S. Conference of Mayors' Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness -- **The Continuing Growth of Hunger, Homelessness, and Poverty in America's Cities: 1987**. I am pleased, because the report reflects the ongoing commitment of local officials -- and their allies in the advocacy, shelter, and private sectors -- to provide the nation's homeless and hungry persons with the basic necessities of life so that they may live with dignity and respect. I am distressed, however, because the survey's findings report a rising tide of homelessness and hunger in our cities, including a growing number of families with children.

The facts reported in this survey underscore a terrible human tragedy. What is most tragic is that all this suffering is unnecessary in a nation as wealthy as ours. The growing epidemic of hunger and homelessness in the United States is the result of the failure of federal government policies.

These include drastic cutbacks in federal housing assistance, job training funds, food stamps, health care and nutrition programs, AFDC benefits, and resources to provide community-based services for the de-institutionalized mentally ill. Federal cuts have ripped huge holes in the so-called "safety net." Many Americans who have fallen through the "net" are now hungry and homeless.

Over 32 million (one out of seven) Americans are living below the poverty line according to government census figures. This represents an increase of over 3 million poor since 1980. Moreover, the poor have grown even poorer. Poor families are now further below the poverty line than at any time since 1963. More than one-fifth of all children live below the poverty line. The "working poor" -- those whose poverty results primarily from low wages -- constitute the fastest growing portion of the poverty population.

Homelessness and hunger are perhaps more understandable during periods of economic distress such as the Great Depression, but not during a period of economic recovery and at a time of national prosperity. As a nation, we have no greater shame than the vast numbers of our

fellow citizens who live on the streets, in alleyways, and in shelters. We have no greater tragedy than the estimated 20 million Americans (including 12 million children) who are hungry, according to Dr. Larry Brown of the Harvard School of Public Health, author of Hunger Reaches Blue-Collar America. We have no greater responsibility than to address their immediate needs while solving the underlying problems of which homelessness and hunger is a symptom.

During the 1980's, as the homeless and hungry population increased each year, state and local governments -- working with non-profit groups, social service agencies, religious institutions, and foundations -- developed many innovative programs to serve the needy. In cities across America, they have been stretching their limited resources to cope with the consequences of federal government failures.

In Boston, for example, the number of shelter beds has increased by 141 percent in the last four years -- from 972 to 2,351. Additional shelters are in the pipeline. HealthLink, Boston's health care program for the homeless, provides comprehensive health care services for homeless persons. The number of soup kitchens and meals programs has expanded; the Boston Food Bank this year is distributing more food to non-profit agencies than ever before. The City has established a job-training program for the homeless and works closely with the shelters to help individuals and families find permanent housing in Boston's tight housing market. In addition, the protection of existing affordable housing, as well as the production of new affordable housing, has been a top priority.

If the record number of people on America's streets and soup kitchens had been driven there by a natural catastrophe, many parts of our country would be declared disaster areas. But even though homelessness and hunger are national problems, the national government has just begun to address these issues. Those of us on the front lines of these issues -- including the nation's mayors -- have lobbied hard to get the federal government to take some responsibility for solving the problem.

The Stewart B. McKinney Act, enacted in July, which provides $355 million in FY 1987 for homeless programs, is a significant first step. But truly meeting the needs of America's homeless -- much less achieving the goal of eliminating homelessness itself -- will require far greater resources. It will require a new commitment on the part of the federal government to deal with the basic problems of permanent housing, poverty, and mental illness.

Toward that end, we need to adopt national policies that reflect our national will to eliminate homelessness, poverty, and hunger.

Our top priority must be a national housing policy that will restore the federal government's role in promoting affordable housing, including the preservation of existing housing and the production of new housing for low-income and working-class persons. We also need a universal system of national health insurance that guarantees decent, affordable health care to every citizen.

We must reward people who work full-time by raising the minimum wage so that they can provide a decent standard of living for their families. By restoring job training programs, we can help the poor lift themselves out of poverty by taking advantage of economic opportunities.

Increasing food stamp benefits and expanding outreach efforts will guarantee that all persons who qualify for food stamps can receive them. Expanding the WIC (women, infants, and children) nutrition program will reduce infant mortality and give children a healthy start in life.

Adequate resources are needed for the mentally ill so that they can have community-based housing, supportive social services, and necessary treatment in order to live as independently as possible. Providing families with children adequate AFDC benefits as well as childcare and job-training opportunities will make it possible to move off welfare and become self-sufficient.

Promoting economic justice for all is the most important challenge facing this nation. We must clarify and reorder our national priorities to meet this challenge. The American people are up to the task. It is critical that our nation's elected leaders in the White House and Congress make room for the homeless -- and the near-homeless -- on the nation's agenda.

Sincerely,

Raymond L. Flynn

Raymond L. Flynn
Mayor of Boston
Chair, Task Force on Hunger
and Homelessness, U.S.
Conference of Mayors

SUMMARY

To assess the current status of hunger, homelessness and poverty in urban America during 1987, the U.S. Conference of Mayors surveyed 26 major cities whose mayors are members of its Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness. The survey sought information from each city on 1) the demand for emergency food assistance and emergency shelter, and the capacity of local agencies to meet that demand; 2) the causes of hunger and homelessness and the demographics of the populations experiencing these problems; 3) the status of housing affordable by low-income people -- a key factor in the increasing incidence of homelessness; 4) economic conditions relating to poverty and unemployment; 5) the impact of the national economic recovery on these problems; and 6) the outlook for these problems in 1988.

HUNGER

- The demand for emergency food assistance increased by an average of 18 percent in all but two (92 percent) of the survey cities. The number of families with children requesting assistance increased in all but one of the survey cities, also by an average of 18 percent. Two-thirds of those requesting emergency food assistance in the survey cities are members of families -- children and their parents.

- An average of 18 percent of the demand for emergency food assistance is unmet in the survey cities. In two out of three of the survey cities, emergency food facilities must turn away people in need because of lack of resources.

- All but one of the survey cities expect the demand for emergency food assistance to increase during 1988. That one city expects it to remain the same during the next year.

- Leading the list of causes of hunger in the survey cities are unemployment and other employment-related problems; inadequate income assistance levels and problems with income assistance programs; and poverty and inadequate income.

- During the last year every survey city used its funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local emergency food assistance efforts. Seventy-three percent of the cities used locally generated revenues, 39 percent used state grants, and 88 percent used federal funds.

HOMELESSNESS

- In every survey city save one the demand for emergency shelter increased during 1987, by an average of 21 percent. The demand did not decrease in any of the cities.

- An average of 23 percent of the demand for emergency shelter in the survey cities goes unmet. In nearly two-thirds of the cities (65 percent) emergency shelters must turn away people in need because of lack of resources.

- Homelessness is expected to continue to increase in 92 percent of the survey cities during 1988.

- The causes of homelessness most frequently identified by the survey cities are the lack of housing affordable by low-income people; mental illness and the lack of services needed by mentally ill persons; and unemployment and other employment-related problems.

- On average, the composition of the cities' homeless population was 49 percent single men, 33 percent families with children, 14 percent single women, and four percent unaccompanied youth. An average of 35 percent of the homeless in the responding cities are substance abusers, 23 percent are severely mentally ill, and 22 percent are employed, in either full or part-time jobs.

- As in the past years, the number of families with children who are homeless continued to grow in 1987, with all but one of the cities reporting an increase among this group. In 71 percent of the responding cities, families constitute the largest group for whom emergency shelter and other needed services are lacking.

- All of the survey cities use city government funds to support local shelters or other services for homeless people. Eighty-five percent use locally generated revenues; just over two-thirds use state grants; and all but one use federal grants.

HOUSING

- During 1987 the demand by low-income households for assisted housing increased in 84 percent of the survey cities; the demand increased on average by just over one-fourth. In none of the cities did it decrease.

- The average wait for assisted housing in the survey cities is nearly two years (22 months); waiting lists for assisted housing programs have been closed in 65 percent of the cities. Assisted housing programs are serving one-third of the eligible low-income households in the survey cities.

- With the decline in federally-assisted housing programs, none of the survey cities expect to be able to meet the housing needs of low-income households in the foreseeable future.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

- Seventy-two percent of the survey cities reported that the number of poor people increased during 1987. Six cities said the number remained the same, and one city reported a decrease in the number of the poor.

- The unemployment situation improved in 12 (48 percent) of the cities and remained the same in nine (36 percent). The situation worsened in the remaining four survey cities. All but two of the survey cities reported that their "official" unemployment rate does not reflect the actual unemployment problem; failure to count discouraged workers was the explanation most frequently cited for this.

- While nearly two-thirds of the survey cities (64 percent) reported that they had benefited in general from the national economic recovery, 81 percent said that the economic recovery had not helped hungry, homeless or other poor people. In the five cities where the economic recovery has helped the poor, that help has often been indirect, through increased charitable giving and availability of services.

INTRODUCTION

In October, 1982 the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the U.S. Conference of City Human Services Officials brought the shortage of emergency services -- food, shelter, medical care, income assistance, energy assistance -- to national attention through a 55-city survey. That survey showed that the demand for emergency services had increased in cities across the nation, and that on average only 43 percent of that demand was being met.

Since that time the Conference has done numerous reports on hunger, homelessness and poverty in cities. These reports have documented the causes and magnitude of the problems, how cities were responding to them and what national responses were required. They include:

- Hunger in American Cities, June, 1983
- Responses to Urban Hunger, October, 1983
- Status Report: Emergency Food, Shelter and Energy Programs in 20 Cities, January, 1984
- Homelessness in America's Cities: Ten Case Studies, June, 1984
- Housing Needs and Conditions in America's Cities, June 1984
- The Urban Poor and the Economic Recovery, September, 1984
- The Status of Hunger in Cities, April, 1985
- Health Care for the Homeless: A 40-City Review, April, 1985
- The Growth of Hunger, Homelessness and Poverty in America's Cities in 1985: A 25-City Survey, January, 1986
- Responding to Homelessness in America's Cities, June, 1986
- The Continued Growth of Hunger, Homelessness and Poverty in America's Cities in 1986: A 25-City Survey, December, 1986
- A Status Report on Homeless Families in America's Cities: A 29-City Survey, May, 1987
- Local Responses to the Needs of Homeless Mentally Ill Persons, May, 1987

To spearhead the Conference's efforts to respond to the emergency services crisis in cities, the President of the Conference of Mayors appointed 20 mayors to a Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness in September, 1983. That Task Force is now chaired by Boston Mayor Raymond L. Flynn, and the number of mayors serving on it has increased to 30. The Task Force meets at least twice each year; many of its members have testified before Congress; and the cities represented on it have provided information to

Conference staff on conditions relating to hunger and homelessness for the various reports that have been prepared.

This report provides information on the current status of hunger, homelessness and the conditions which have affected them in 26 of the cities represented on the Task Force. It is made possible by a grant from the Primerica Foundation. The data were collected from the cities for the period of November 1, 1986 to October 31, 1987 during November and December, 1987.

HUNGER

The demand for emergency food assistance in general, and by families in particular, increased in more than nine out of ten of the survey cities during the last year, by an average of 18 percent. Two-thirds of those requesting emergency food assistance in the survey cities are families with children. The capacity of emergency food assistance facilities increased in just over one-half of the survey cities, by an average of nine percent. Every survey city has used city government funds to support local emergency food assistance efforts. An average of 18 percent of the demand for emergency food assistance goes unmet in the survey cities, and in two-thirds of the cities emergency food assistance facilities must turn away people in need because of lack of resources. All but one of the survey cities expect the demand for emergency food assistance to increase during 1988.

THE DEMAND

The demand for emergency food assistance during the last year increased in all but two, or 92 percent, of the survey cities. The average amount of the increase was 18 percent, ranging from seven percent in San Antonio, eight percent in Los Angeles and Nashville, and 10 percent in Cleveland to 25 percent in Philadelphia and Portsmouth, 30 percent in San Francisco and Trenton and 46 percent in San Juan. Louisville and Salt Lake City reported that the demand for emergency food assistance remained the same during the last year. No city reported a decrease in demand.

The number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance during the last year increased in all but one of the survey cities. Once again, the average amount of the increase was 18 percent, ranging from five percent in Louisville, six percent in Detroit and San Antonio, 14 percent in Seattle and 15 percent in Kansas City, Portland, and San Francisco to 25 percent in Phoenix, Providence and Trenton, 30 percent in Norfolk and San Juan and 32 percent in Chicago. Nashville reported that the number of families with children requesting assistance remained the same during the last year. No city reported a decrease in demand by families with children.

Two out of every three people requesting emergency food assistance in the survey cities are either children or their parents. The percentage of families with children requesting emergency food assistance was below 50 percent in four cities -- Chicago, San Juan, San Francisco and Seattle. In seven cities, three-quarters or more of those requesting emergency food assistance were families with children: Charleston, Cleveland, Los Angeles, New York City, Providence, San Antonio and Trenton.

THE CAPACITY

The unduplicated count of people provided emergency food assistance on a typical day during the last year in the survey cities varied significantly, usually reflecting the size of the city. Assisting under 500 people on an average day were Louisville, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Norfolk,

Saint Paul, San Juan and Trenton. Assisting over 2000 per day were Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Portland, San Antonio and the District of Columbia.

The Level of Resources Available

The level of resources available to emergency food assistance facilities increased in 13 of the cities (52 percent), decreased in six cities (24 percent) and stayed the same in another six. Those cities which registered an increase were Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Kansas City, Louisville, New Orleans, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, San Juan, San Antonio, San Francisco and Washington, D.C. Experiencing decreased resources were Detroit, Portsmouth, Saint Paul, Salt Lake City, Seattle and Trenton.

Across the survey cities there was an overall increase of nine percent in the level of resources available to emergency food assistance facilities. Norfolk had a two percent increase in the level of available resources, Chicago a ten percent increase, San Francisco a 15 percent increase, San Antonio an 18 percent increase, Boston a less than 20 percent increase, Kansas City a 20 percent increase and New Orleans a 30 percent increase. In Detroit resources available to emergency food assistance facilities decreased by 25 percent.

The city officials commented on the changes in the level of resources available to emergency food assistance facilities:

> Charleston: "The Charleston Interfaith Crisis Ministry added food assistance one year ago to the city's pool of food resources, but demand still outweighs the resources available."
>
> Chicago: "In 1987 there were increases in local (the City's corporate supplement), state (Illinois Department of Public Aid) and federal (FEMA) funds."
>
> Kansas City: "Resources have increased as a result of increased awareness. This awareness has produced increased local food drives and volunteer projects. More commodities were distributed during the year as well, and there were increases in donations through the Second Harvest National Food Bank."
>
> San Antonio: "The number of emergency food pantries increased 19 percent; there was an increase of 28.4 percent in the amount of food distributed; the number of volunteers assisting in food distribution increased seven percent."
>
> San Francisco: "(1) The San Francisco Food Bank reports a record-setting amount of food in the first quarter of 1987. (2) Major congregate food sites have experienced an increase in the number of volunteers. (3) New major food drives have been mounted in 1987 -- San Francisco 49'ers collect donations at games, Tower Records gives discounts for food donated, Safeway began a new food drive and 250 small businesses are involved in food drives with their employees."

Los Angeles: "Funds decreased by 20 percent, food stayed the same and volunteers increased by five percent. The city's largest emergency food provider reported a 50 percent decrease in local food donations. However, they were able to keep up with the previous year's level by increasing food donations from sources outside the area. Funding sources have decreased, particularly from foundations and corporations."

New York City: "The level of resources has remained unchanged from last year. New York City funding continues at just above $2 million; the number of volunteers fluctuates, as under normal circumstances; privately donated food resources have shrunk."

Portland: "It is more difficult to obtain donated food from major manufacturers due to mergers and the sale of salvaged food. With the threatened reductions in USDA foods, there will be less food next year with an anticipated increase in demand."

Detroit: "The costs of food and operating increased, some volunteer 'burn-out' has occurred and the number of private donations has decreased."

Portsmouth: "Area church groups and volunteer agencies are exhausting their funding sources."

Saint Paul: "There has been a loss in financial support, an increase in volunteers and a 15 percent increase in food donations, but we are still short of meeting the need."

Seattle: "There has been a decrease in funding (approximately 20 to 30 percent) below the previous year's level and volunteer help remains steady. While the amount of food stuffs donated has increased, through Safeway and Associated Grocers (AG) Salvage, the amount of junk food and other items (i.e. cat litter, pet food, charcoal) has increased dramatically."

Trenton: "The organization and distribution of federal food commodities has been difficult to arrange on a consistent basis. Emergency food agencies tend to receive less funds than emergency shelter programs. This is attributed to the more complex nature of the area's food needs and the food distribution system."

Emergency Food Assistance Facilities, For Emergencies Only or a Steady Source of Food

Just over three-fourths of the cities (77 percent) reported that emergency food assistance facilities were used for emergencies only; just under three-fourths (73 percent) said they were used as a steady source of food for a long time. Thirteen cities reported that facilities were used both for emergencies and as a steady source of food: Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Portland, Providence, Saint Paul, Salt Lake City, San Juan, Seattle and Washington, D.C. The city officials commented on the way in which emergency food assistance facilities are used:

Boston: "Hunger has become a chronic issue with the need for food assistance an ongoing one for some people, a temporary one for others."

Chicago: "Overall, 40 percent of the food clients used the program only once, while 60 percent were repeaters, receiving food an average of six times per year. This latter use of the 'emergency' food program constitutes a heavy drain on limited resources."

Detroit: "Emergency food pantries provide bags of food for clients to take home. They have their own criteria which varies with each program, but generally they all impose some kind of limit on the number of times a client can use their particular service -- once-a-month, or only once every 90 days or once every six months. Soup kitchens, on-site feeding programs, do not usually require proof of need and serve anyone as often as they come in."

Los Angeles: "Agencies that have restrictions requiring them to provide only emergency food do so. However, agencies with fewer funding limitations have been put in the position of providing a steady source of food due to the increased number of families that keep coming back."

Minneapolis: "Up to three days of food per month is used as a supplement for minimum wage jobs."

Nashville: "Although some programs provide emergency food assistance only, some others provide food assistance on a continuing basis. Consequently, the initial provision of food could very well be the response to an emergency, but if the need for food assistance continues, the same person or family who received an emergency service can continue to receive food assistance from some agencies in this community."

New Orleans: "Most emergency food assistance consists of a three-day emergency food box. It is not meant to be given out as a food supplement. Persons are limited to one box in a three month period."

New York City: "It is the nature of food emergencies in New York City that they are recurrent, i.e. monthly. As family funds dwindle during the month, food emergencies increase."

Norfolk: "Churches and other agencies are contacted when people do not qualify for or are delayed in receiving food stamps."

Philadelphia: "Emergency food assistance is intended for emergencies. There are consistent repeaters, however, due to changes in federal and state regulations regarding income and the Mayor's policy not to turn away anyone who is hungry."

Phoenix: "Emergency food boxes are on a one-time basis, but more and more repeated requests are made, which documents a continuing need for emergency food services."

Portland: "Agencies using the food bank have income requirements and certain restrictions, such as once-a-month or once every three months. The average is two to three times a year. The shelter and food line programs, however, are a steady source of food for many."

Providence: "Many families are repeatedly using emergency food assistance facilities as a stop-gap measure until their next food stamp allotment is issued."

Salt Lake City: "Emergency food orders are limited at food banks, but many persons rely on soup kitchens as a steady supply of food."

San Antonio: "Food assistance facilities strive to maintain a sufficient food supply to respond to emergency situations. These facilities do not have the capability to provide a steady source of food for periods of long duration. However, there are a significant number of families that require additional food every month."

San Francisco: "Staff at food sites report seeing an increase in the number of single persons and families who are fed on a regular, daily basis."

Seattle: "Some clients use facilities as an emergency food source, such as those who are underemployed or earning minimum wage. While others, the unemployed, tend to use programs as a steady source of food."

The Quantity and Quality of Food Provided

Emergency food assistance facilities are able to provide an adequate quantity of food to recipients in 12 (46 percent) of the survey cities; they are unable to provide an adequate quantity of food in the remaining 14. Those cities in which facilities were able to provide an adequate quantity of food were Chicago, Cleveland, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Portsmouth, San Antonio and San Franciso. Facilities were able to provide nutritionally-balanced food in 65 percent (17) of the survey cities: Charleston, Chicago, Detroit, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Porstmouth, Providence, Salt Lake City, San Juan, San Francisco and Trenton. Emergency food assistance facilities are unable to provide nutritionally-balanced food in the remaining nine cities. Commenting on the quantity and quality of the food provided, the city officials said:

Phoenix: "Every effort is made to provide nutritionally balanced food boxes of four basic staples, but it is not always possible, so what is on hand and in supply is provided."

Chicago: "The family food box contains 31 items and 34 pounds (net weight) of food and is sufficient to feed a family of four for four days. Its contents are reviewed annually by a nutritionist, who also prepares sample menus for inclusion in the box."

Portland: "Food boxes are somewhat adequate and are required to be nutritionally balanced. However, if the USDA surplus commodities are eliminated or drastically reduced, then it would not be possible to provide nutritionally balanced food. It would be too expensive to purchase the food staples now received through USDA."

New Orleans: "The food bank has a nutritionist who plans the food box so that it contains food that is healthy and nutritious. The adequate quantity of food is only for the three-day emergency supply, not an adequate quantity for larger periods of time."

Boston: "The food supply is constrained by what is contributed; the food industry is not donating high-quality, nutritious foods."

Cleveland: "Distribution depends on supply, which is a function of cyclical funding and donations and food availability."

Kansas City: "Food pantries are limited in what they can provide, to those items which have been donated. They attempt to provide nutritional balances, but it is not always possible."

Los Angeles: "The demand for emergency food assistance is greater than the food and money available. For instance, it was reported that 80 percent of the United Way food providers are food pantries which provide only donated foods. These foods are not nutritionally balanced. The reporting organizations indicated that a few agencies are able to provide nutritionally balanced meals when they are able to supplement the donated food with food purchased with FEMA money, specifically non-perishable protein."

Minneapolis: "People are limited to three days of emergency food per month. It is believed that people would ask for more."

New York City: "The ability of kitchens and pantries to stock an adequate quantity of food is severely limited due to space and resources. In general, food donations increase during holidays and fall off during other times. Given the high cost of space in this city, storage facilities are generally small, thus reducing an organization's capacity to maintain adequate quantities of food."

Seattle: "The quantity of food available is never consistent: Some months (November to February) the types and quantity of food are high, while other months (May to September) food programs scrape together what they can. Overall, the nutritional value of food given away in any given month could be improved considerably."

Providence: "Due to increased demand, food baskets contain one to two days supply. Families must return more frequently and find that the supply is exhausted."

Saint Paul: "Because food assistance facilities rely totally on donations to fill the void, nutritionally-balanced meals may not be available."

San Antonio" "Every effort is made to provide food that is nutritiously balanced. However, the large majority of food in San Antonio is distributed through the food bank, which has no control over the food donated. Meat and other protein items are in particularly short supply. Many pantries are able to purchase additional food; however, their budget is limited."

THE FUNDING

During the last year every survey city used city government funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local emergency food assistance efforts. The funds come from a variety of sources:

- Nineteen cities (73 percent) used locally generated revenues: Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, New York City, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Saint Paul, San Antonio, San Francisco, San Juan, Seattle, Trenton and Washington, D.C.

- Ten cities (39 percent) used state grants: Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Providence, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle and Trenton.

- Federal funds were used in 23 cities (88 percent): Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Portsmouth, Providence, Saint Paul, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Francisco, San Juan, Seattle and Trenton.

    * The Community Development Block Grant was used by 11 cities: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Portland, Providence, Salt Lake City, San Francisco and Seattle.

    * Nine cities used the Community Services Block Grant: Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Portland, Providence, San Antonio and San Francisco.

    * Nineteen cities used the FEMA Emergency Food and Shelter grant for to support emergency food assistance efforts: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Portland, Portsmouth, Providence, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle, and Trenton.

THE UNMET NEED

An average of 18 percent of the demand for emergency food assistance goes unmet in the survey cities. The unmet need ranges from two to three percent in Philadelphia, five percent in San Antonio and San Francisco and nine percent in Kansas City to 50 percent in Trenton and 66 percent in San

Juan. Minneapolis and Portland reported that none of the demand for emergency food assistance goes unmet.

Two out of every three of the survey cities reported that emergency food assistance facilities have to turn away people in need because of lack of resources. Inadequate supplies of food was the reason most frequently cited. Among the comments from the city officials:

Charleston: "When food supplies are depleted, those in need cannot be served."

Chicago: "We turned away some family maintenance users during the third quarter of 1987 in order to conserve the supply of food for families with true emergencies."

Louisville: "A client can visit the food bank sites only four times a calendar year, so clients are turned away. But the centers review each case individually....Dare to Care (our food bank program) is already predicting a very tight budget for 1988 because contributions are down."

Providence: "Emergency food resources are expended at a greater rate, resulting in a growing gap between the allocation of resources to sites and the distribution of food by the sites."

Salt Lake City: "Sometimes food supplies are limited and the number and frequency of visits are restricted. The problem is especially severe at the end of each month, when food stamp allotments have been exhausted."

San Antonio: "The quantities of food being distributed to those in need has increased every year since 1983. The demand, however, simply exceeds the resources available."

San Juan: "There are different reasons to turn away people in these programs: waiting lists, excessive demand, eligibility criteria."

Trenton: There is a "lack of staff and resources in most cases."

New York City: "Resources in this sense are not only characterized by food and financial resources, but also by the administrative skills necessary to maintain an organization. Many small, local efforts require professional attention toward functions such as grants acquisition and inventory control, as well as general operations. A shortfall, or problem, in these areas may create a situation in which people are turned away."

THE CAUSES

Unemployment and other employment-related problems, inadequate benefit levels, poverty and inadequate income lead the list of causes of hunger in the survey cities.

- A total of 18 cities cited employment-related problems as a cause of hunger.
  - * Specifically citing unemployment were Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Portsmouth, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Juan, Seattle and Washington, D.C.
  - * Underemployment was mentioned by Boston, Los Angeles, Louisville, New Orleans, Phoenix, Portland, and Seattle.
  - * Low wages was a cause cited by Los Angeles, Louisville, New Orleans, Phoenix, Portland, Saint Paul and San Francisco.
  - * Seasonal employment was cited by Charleston and Portsmouth.

- Thirteen cities listed inadequate benefit levels in public assistance programs as a cause: Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, Louisville, New Orleans, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Providence, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, San Juan and Trenton. Cuts in food assistance programs were mentioned by Boston and Seattle; cuts in social services by Phoenix and Providence. Lack of information and difficulty in accessing benefits were cited by Kansas City, Nashville, Portland, Saint Paul and San Francisco. Problems with benefit programs, such as delayed processing, were mentioned by Charleston, Kansas City and San Antonio.

- Ten cities listed inadequate income as a cause of hunger: Chicago, Kansas City, Minneapolis, Nashville, Portsmouth, San Antonio, San Juan, Seattle, Trenton and Washington, D.C. Nine cities listed poverty: Boston, Kansas City, Los Angeles, New Orleans, New York City, Norfolk, San Antonio, San Juan and Washington, D.C.

Other causes identified for the problem of hunger were:

- Lack of affordable housing -- by Boston, Los Angeles, Providence, San Francisco, Trenton and New York City;

- Family crisis -- by Chicago, Kansas City, Norfolk, Portsmouth and Saint Paul;

- Changing economy -- by Cleveland and Louisville;

- Substance abuse -- by San Francisco and San Juan; and the

- Increased cost of basic necessities -- by Providence and New York City.

Additional causes cited include lack of day care, homelessness, lack of utilities or cooking facilities, and lack of transportation.

THE OUTLOOK

All but one of the survey cities (96 percent) expect the demand for emergency food assistance to increase during 1988. Cleveland expects the

demand to remain the same next year. The reasons given by the city officials for the expected increase are often complex:

Boston: "The expected increase in the demand for emergency food assistance in 1988 is based on the continued lack of federal commitment to addressing the root causes of hunger. Despite the efforts of Dr. Larry Brown of the Harvard School of Public Health to draw attention to the breadth of the nation's hunger problem, and to those of Congressman Leon Panetta of California to sponsor effective approaches to the problem, hunger in the United States will continue to increase due to inadequate federal action. Irresponsible and inequitable approaches to reducing the federal budget deficit, such as Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation, will only worsen the problem.

"In Boston, the generosity of our citizens -- corporate as well as individual -- has done much to mitigate the hunger problem at the local level. With a food pantry system which serves as a national model, and an annual food drive which will generate 50,000 cans of food, and a monthly food drive among public transit commuters, Boston's contribution to the fight against hunger is substantial. However, despite this magnanimity, the need for food assistance continues to grow. One can only point to the unfairness and lack of generosity in Washington as the reasons."

Chicago: "There has been no significant improvement in the economic status of the City's poor and near poor."

Detroit: "Both Chrysler and GM have announced lay-offs. The Detroit Board of Education has announced lay-offs and the government of Wayne County has announced lay-offs. These will have a domino effect on industries and services which tie in to the auto industry, as well as in the area of government and education. Sustained unemployment with benefits eventually running out, and no reabsorption back into the labor force, will add to the food emergency."

Kansas City: "There has been a continued increase in demand for food assistance in Kansas City over the past 12 months. Unlike 1986, demand has not decreased at any point during 1987. Local officials consider this a trend not likely to change without significant permanent economic intervention."

Louisville: "Individuals and families are going to continue to be unable to meet their basic needs of food, shelter and clothing."

Los Angeles: "In the event of a recession, the demand for emergency food will increase. The increased number of applicant agencies to United Way to provide emergency food assistance and consistent agency reports that they were serving at capacity were indicators that the demand for emergency food will continue to increase."

Nashville: "There are seasonal increases in the demand for emergency food assistance which occur each year. However, based upon the projections for population growth in this community over the next 10 years, we would expect some of that growth to take place in 1988 with

an accompanying increase in the demand for emergency food assistance by those people with low or no income."

New Orleans: "Economic conditions among the poor are not better. With economic cuts on the federal and state levels and unemployment and underemployment, needs will increase."

Norfolk: "With the closing of low-income housing such as Lafayette Shores, more people will be forced to pay more for housing and will have less money for food. Federal cutbacks in social service programs will also increase the need."

Philadelphia: "The demand will increase "specifically as a response to federal legislation effective October 1, 1987, reducing the income entitlements to disabled, elderly and blind."

Phoenix: We "do not foresee the dramatic increases of the past. Many of the 'new poor' are unaware of their eligibility for food stamps or emergency food resources. Many are unwilling or unprepared to use resources for which they are eligible."

Portland: "The food bank is anticipating a dramatic increase; the first quarter of this fiscal year showed a 21 percent increase. The problem is expected to continue due to the USDA cut, reductions and delay in LIHEAP, and other domestic cutbacks at the federal level."

Portsmouth: "We expect an "increase in requests due to loss of employment, based on the overall economic outlook."

Providence: "Because of increasing rents and property values, more people are being forced to lose limited emergency resources. In a two-wage earner family, when one loses a job, the family is forced to seek assistance."

Saint Paul: "The problem of underemployment will likely continue. Much of the level of demand is tied to the health of the national economy. Recent economic indicators suggest a possible recession or economic slowdown on the horizon."

Salt Lake City: "Due to poor economic conditions, it is expected that demand will continue to increase significantly."

San Antonio: "If the economic trend of previous years continues, it is anticipated that the demand for emergency food assistance will increase."

San Francisco: "(1) Individuals and families are going to continue to be unable to meet their basic needs for food, shelter and clothing. (2) There has been a steady increase in need for the last few years and nothing has happened to indicate a change for the better. Current experiences, in fact, indicate a worsening of the situation. (3) Because of rent controls, rents will continue to rise and benefit levels will not keep pace with those increases. (4) Minimum wage for low-skilled jobs will not be sufficient to meet rising costs."

Seattle: "(1) The continual erosion of the WIC and other food programs (school breakfast and lunch) will cause more people to depend on emergency food programs to supplement their diet. (2) Maintenance of the minimum wage at $3.85 per hour forces people to rely on emergency food programs. This is a result of payment of housing and utility costs before purchasing food."

Trenton: "(1) The welfare reform package fails to include sufficient supportive services to welfare families. (2) The cost of basic needs continues to increase while income remains stable. (3) Less money is being appropriated to help the poor. As a result there are less housing assistance, adequate jobs and job training."

CITY DATA ON HUNGER

CITY	PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY FOOD IN 1987	PRECENTAGE INCREASE IN FAMILIES' DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY FOOD IN 1987	PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES REQUESTING EMERGENCY FOOD IN 1987	LEVEL OF RESOURCES	FOOD ASSISTANCE FACILITIES PROVIDE ADEAUATE QUANTITY OF FOOD	FOOD ASSISTANCE FACILITIES PROVIDE NUTRITIONALLY BALANCED FOOD	PERCENTAGE OF UNMET NEED	ARE PEOPLE BEING TURNED AWAY?
BOSTON	20	20+	60	increased	no	no	10	yes
CHARLESTON	na	na	95	increased	no	yes	na	yes
CHICAGO	32	32	47	increased	yes	yes	28	yes
CLEVELAND	10	na	85	same	yes	no	10	yes
DETROIT	21	6	60	decreased	no	yes	na	yes
KANSAS CITY	15	15	80	increased	no	no	9	yes
LOS ANGELES	8	20	75	*	no	no	20	yes
LOUISVILLE	0	5	68	increased	yes	yes	10	yes
MINNEAPOLIS	16	na	na	same	no	yes	0	no
NASHVILLE	8	0	61.5	same	yes	yes	na	no
NEW ORLEANS	20	20	70	increased	yes	yes	20	yes
NEW YORK CITY	20	20	85	same	no	yes	na	yes
NORFOLK	17	30	63	increased	yes	no	23	na
PHILADELPHIA	25	na	na	increased	yes	yes	2-3	yes
PHOENIX	18	25	50	increased	yes	yes	20	no
PORTLAND	11	15	50+	same	yes	yes	0	no
PORTSMOUTH	25	na	60	decreased	yes	yes	na	no
PROVIDENCE	20	25	90	same	no	yes	25	yes
SAINT PAUL	15-18	20	70	decreased	no	no	na	no
SALT LAKE CITY	0	na	70	decreased	no	yes	na	no
SAN ANTONIO	7	6	92	increased	yes	no	5	yes
SAN FRANCISCO	30	15	40	increased	yes	yes	5	no
SAN JUAN	46	30	43	increased	no	yes	66	yes
SEATTLE	12	14	46	decreased	no	no	na	yes
TRENTON	30	25	75	decreased	no	yes	50	yes
WASHINGTON	na	na	na	increased	no	no	na	na

*Funds decreased by 20%; food stayed the same; volunteers increased by 5%

HOMELESSNESS

During the last year, the demand for emergency shelter increased in 96 percent of the survey cities and is expected to continue to increase in the next year. The number of families with children who are homeless continued to grow, with 96 percent of the cities also reporting an increase among this group. In 65 percent of the survey cities shelters must turn away people in need because of lack of resources. Many of those persons are children and their families. In 71 percent of the cities, families comprise the largest group for whom emergency shelter and other needed services are particularly lacking.

THE DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY SHELTER

During the past year the demand for emergency shelter increased in 96 percent of the cities. The average increase was 21 percent. In none of the cities did the demand decrease; one city -- Louisville -- reported no change. Kansas City reported the highest increase, 44 percent, followed by Philadelphia with 40 percent; San Juan with 35 percent; Providence with 30 percent, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle with 25 percent, Charleston and Nashville with 23 percent; and Minneapolis, New Orleans and Salt Lake City with 20 percent. Increases of less than 20 percent were reported by Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, New York City, Norfolk, Phoenix, Portland, Saint Paul, San Antonio, Trenton, and Washington, D.C.

THE POPULATION

Although there are significant variations in the composition of the homeless population in the survey cities, on average, almost half (49 percent) of the homeless persons are single men, 33 percent are families with children, 14 percent are single women, and four percent are unaccompanied youth (age 18 and under). Minneapolis has the highest percentage of single men, with 80 percent, followed by Louisville with 75 percent, Phoenix with 70 percent, Cleveland with 66 percent, Boston with 65, and New Orleans and Salt Lake City with 60 percent. Other cities where half or more of the homeless population are single men are Nashville, Norfolk, San Antonio, San Juan, and Seattle.

Families with children comprise 65 percent of those persons who are homeless in Providence. In New York City 17,839, or 63 percent, of the 28,439 persons currently housed by the City in shelters or transitional housing are members of families. Half or more of those who are homeless in Portsmouth, and Trenton are families with children. In Portland, 52 percent of those served in the voucher/shelter system are family members. Other cities where families comprise 30 percent or more of the homeless population include Kansas City (43 percent), Chicago and Detroit (40 percent), Norfolk (35 percent), Philadelphia and Saint Paul (33 percent), and Los Angeles, Salt Lake City, San Antonio and Seattle (30 percent).

On average, single women comprise 14 percent of the homeless population in the responding cities. Estimates of the percentage of homeless single women range from 32 percent in San Francisco, 24 percent in Philadelphia, 20 percent in Chicago, Saint Paul and Salt Lake City, and 15 percent in Boston to three percent in Charleston and San Juan.

Unaccompanied youths (18 years of age or under) on average constitute four percent of the homeless population in the cities. (It should be noted, however, that in many cities statistical data on homeless youths are not separated from those on single adults. Therefore, a zero percentage does not necessarily mean that there are no homeless youths in that city.) Cities where unaccompanied youths comprise ten percent or more of the homeless population include San Juan (20 percent), San Antonio (14 percent), Nashville (11 percent), New Orleans and Los Angeles (10 percent).

An average of 26 percent of the homeless persons in the responding cities are considered to be severely mentally ill, ranging from 50 percent in San Juan, 45 percent in San Francisco, 40 percent in Louisville, Minneapolis and Seattle, 25 percent in Chicago, New York City and Salt Lake City, and 20 percent in Charleston, Phoenix, Portland, Philadelphia and Providence to nine percent in Detroit. Detroit officials noted, however, that the nine percent includes only individuals who have a documented history of mental illness. Local studies report, they add, that about 25 percent of the homeless population suffer from severe stress and disorientation as a result of being homeless. According to a report conducted this year in Saint Paul, 23 percent of the homeless individuals interviewed indicated that they have a mental health problem; nine percent reported that they are currently being treated for mental illness.

On average, 35 percent of the responding cities' homeless population are substance abusers. Half or more of the people who are homeless in Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Portland, and San Juan have substance abuse problems. Other cities where 30 percent or more of the homeless individuals are substance abusers are Charleston, Detroit, Louisville, New Orleans, New York City, Providence, Saint Paul, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, Seattle and Trenton.

An average of 22 percent of the homeless people in the responding cities are employed, in either full-time or part-time jobs. Over half, or 54 percent, of the homeless persons in San Antonio work. Other estimates range from 39 percent in San Juan, 35 percent in Kansas City; 30 percent in Charleston, Chicago and Seattle, 25 percent in Philadelphia and Salt Lake City to 10 percent in Los Angeles, Louisville, San Francisco and Trenton and five percent in Minneapolis. Detroit officials reported that "while figures on the number of employed homeless persons are not available at this time, recent monitoring of this phenomenon indicates that the working poor are beginning to come into shelters in greater numbers." In Nashville, where approximately 28 percent of the homeless persons have some type of job, a special transitional shelter which can accommodate about 12 men at a given time has been established to serve the special needs of this group. Boston officials stated "the seriousness of the problem of homelessness is reflected in the fact that increasing numbers of homeless persons are employed yet unable to find or afford housing due to high housing costs, low vacancy rates, and conversion of rental housing to condominiums." Officials

in San Antonio and Salt Lake City noted, however, that the jobs available to homeless persons are mostly temporary and unstable, such a day-labor.

CHANGES IN THE HOMELESS POPULATION

All of the survey cities reported that the characteristics of their homeless population had changed in the past year. The most significant difference, as indicated in the Conference of Mayors' last two annual reports, continues to be the growing number of families with children who are homeless, with 96 percent of the cities indicating an increase among this group. The average increase was 32 percent, ranging from 144 percent in Charleston, 75 percent in Providence, 66 percent in Philadelphia, 40 percent in Los Angeles, 30 percent in Norfolk, 20 percent in Cleveland, Salt Lake City and San Antonio, and 15 percent in Detroit, Portland and Trenton, to two percent in Saint Paul. Only one city -- Louisville -- reported no change. In none of the cities did the number of homeless families decrease

The number of homeless single women increased in 21, or 84 percent, of the responding cities, by an average of 16 percent. Providence reported the highest increase among this group, 63 percent, followed by Los Angeles, with 25 percent; Salt Lake City with 20 percent; and New York City, Portland, and Philadelphia with 15 percent. Increases of less than 15 percent were reported by Boston, Detroit, Kansas City, Saint Paul, San Antonio, San Francisco and Trenton. The number of homeless single women stayed the same in Charleston, Louisville, Norfolk and Phoenix.

Sixteen cities, or 64 percent of those which responded, said that the number of single men had grown. The average increase was 21 percent, ranging from 50 percent in Providence, 25 percent in Los Angeles and Trenton, 20 percent in Detroit and Salt Lake City, and 15 percent in Portland, to two percent in San Francisco. Louisville officials indicated that although the total number of homeless single men did not change, they "are seeing a growing number of young males between the ages of 18 and 25 who are homeless. Many are the hard core unemployed and lack job skills." The number of homeless single men decreased in four cities, by an average of 14 percent. The estimated decrease ranged from 24 percent in San Antonio, 20 percent in Detroit, 16 percent in Kansas City, and seven percent in Saint Paul, to two percent in San Francisco. Charleston, Louisville, Norfolk and Phoenix reported no change in this group.

Nine of the twelve cities able to respond to the question regarding changes in the number of homeless unaccompanied youths, reported an increase in this group. They are Cleveland, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Portland, Portsmouth, Providence, Salt Lake City and Seattle. The number of homeless youths did not change in Charleston, Louisville and Norfolk.

In the past year, the number of homeless persons who work in either full-time or part-time positions increased in 72 percent of the responding cities. The average increase was 13 percent, ranging from three percent in San Francisco, and five percent in Charleston and Kansas City, to 25 percent in Los Angeles and Salt Lake City. The number of working homeless persons

stayed the same in Louisville, Phoenix, Providence, Saint Paul and Trenton. It did not decrease in any of the cities.

An increase in the number of homeless persons who are severely mentally ill was reported by 12 cities, or 80 percent of those which responded. They include Chicago, Cleveland, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Portland, Portsmouth, Seattle and Trenton. The estimated increase among this group ranged from ten percent in Providence, to 20 percent in Salt Lake City and 25 percent in Los Angeles. Officials in Louisville indicated that "for whatever reason, our community is seeing more homeless mentally ill, both men and women. This is a national tragedy that should be addressed at the national level." The number of severely mentally ill persons who are homeless stayed the same in three cities: Charleston, Phoenix, and Washington, D.C.

Seventy-eight percent of the responding cities indicated that the number of homeless persons who are substance abusers increased in the past year. The average increase was 26 percent, ranging from two percent in Saint Paul, 12 percent in Portland, 20 percent in Philadelphia and Salt Lake City, and 25 percent in Los Angeles, to 50 percent in Providence and 75 percent in Trenton.

CAUSES

A number of diverse and complex factors have contributed to the growing problem of homelessness in cities. Many of those causes are interrelated. Those most frequently identified by the cities are the lack of affordable housing and other housing problems, mental illness and the lack of services needed by mentally ill persons, and unemployment and other employment related problems. Other major causes of homelessness include a high incidence of poverty, the high cost of living and other economic problems, low benefit levels and other problems related to income maintenance programs, substance abuse and lack of needed services, population shifts, and domestic violence.

Lack of Adequate Low-Cost Housing

Twenty-two, or 85 percent, of the survey cities identified lack of housing affordable by low-income people and other housing related problems as a principal cause of homelessness. Among those cities are Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Portsmouth, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, Seattle, Trenton, and Washington, D.C. The "loss of low-income rental housing that is suitable, safe and sanitary" was cited by Detroit, Kansas City and Norfolk referred to the loss of low-income substandard housing that is declared uninhabitable. Officials in Phoenix and Salt Lake City identified the destruction of single room occupancy hotels and other low cost housing, as a factor which has contributed to the problem. In Philadelphia, a principal cause of homelessness is "the lack of subsidized housing and of low-cost, single room occupancies units." Nashville, Providence and Kansas City mentioned gentrification, which often results in the displacement of low-income persons. Boston officials specifically identified cuts in federal housing assistance programs as a principal cause of homelessness. Other comments offered by city officials include:

Louisville: "Lack of affordable housing is a primary casual factor of homelessness in Louisville. Section 8 and public housing have all but disappeared for the poor, and there is now very little low-income housing available in the city. It is critically important for the federal government to realize that subsidized housing is its responsibility and a vital need in most urban areas."

New York City: "The undiminished poverty population and the shortage of low-income housing are primary causes of homelessness. The housing shortage results from the deterioration and abandonment of low-income subsidies. Between 1982 and 1986, New York City experienced cumulative net losses in excess of $172 million due to federal housing disinvestment. One-third of the city's housing is over 60 years old and the vacancy rate for non-luxury apartments has remained below two percent since 1984."

Saint Paul: "A combination of economic and social problems contribute to homelessness. For some families, those whose family heads are able to live independently, the primary problem is economic -- the housing they are in is either not affordable, or inadequately sized, or suffers from code deficiencies. These families could live independently and need not be homeless if they had adequate income and housing choices. The federal government's retreat from its traditional role as the provider of affordable permanent housing for low-income families with children is a basic factor contributing to the city's inability to keep pace with the increasing demand for affordable, large-bedroom units.

Mental Illness/Lack of Needed Services

Mental illness combined with a lack of services needed by mentally ill individuals was identified as a cause of homelessness by almost two-thirds of the cities (65 percent). These cities include Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Minneapolis, Nashville, New York City, Norfolk, Portland, San Antonio, and Seattle. Officials in San Francisco indicated "mental health treatment monies have never followed patients who have been released from the state hospitals, resulting in the inavailability of needed services within the community." Similarly, Salt Lake City officials noted that the "release of institutionalized mentally ill patients without adequate community residential placement" has led to an increase in the number of homeless persons in the city. The lack of mental health facilities is a principal cause of homelessness in San Juan. Limitations of the mental health system were identified as a cause of the problem in New Orleans.

Employment Related Problems

Sixty-two percent of the cities cited unemployment and other employment related problems, which directly affect a person's ability to afford housing as a principal cause of homelessness. Among them are Chicago, Portland, Salt Lake City, New Orleans, San Antonio, Kansas City, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. One-third of those cities -- Nashville, New Orleans, Norfolk, Philadelphia and San Francisco -- specifically mentioned lack of non-skilled jobs or of work skills needed to compete in the labor market.

San Francisco officials reported there is a "shortage of blue collar, non-technical jobs." Several cities cited the lack of full-time, and steady employment. Charleston and Portsmouth, for example, indicated that many of the jobs available are seasonal; Portsmouth also mentioned that the jobs are often part-time.

Over half (56 percent) of the cities which identified employment related problems as a cause of homelessness, specifically cited low wages which are insufficient to meet the high cost of housing and other necessities. Those cities include Chicago, Kansas City, Portland, Cleveland, Norfolk, Nashville and San Francisco. Louisville officials indicated that a local study "states very clearly that in order for a family of three to meet the basic needs of life, it will require working at least 40 hours a week at $7.00 an hour. Many of the families on entitlements or the working poor make considerably less."

Economic Factors

Over half (53 percent) of the survey cities cited economic factors, such as the high incidence of poverty, inadequate income, and the high cost of living as principal causes of homelessness. Among those cities are Los Angeles, Kansas City, Louisville, New Orleans, Norfolk, New York City, and Trenton. Kansas City officials indicated that "homelesness is another of the faces of poverty in this community. Persons become homeless when they can no longer afford permanent housing..." Officials in San Francisco stated: "fixed and low incomes have not kept pace with the increasing costs of living."

Inadequate Income Assistance Programs

Eleven cities, or 42 percent, specifically mentioned problems with income maintenance programs, primarily low benefit levels which are not sufficient to meet the high cost of living. Among them are Louisville, Boston, Chicago, Norfolk, Seattle, and Cleveland. Detroit officials indicated that "benefit levels have not kept pace with inflation." San Francisco reported that "benefits (and minimum wages) are not sufficient to last the entire month." They also indicated that "there is a steady increase in the numbers of persons whose benefits have expired (e.g., unemployment insurance) or have been temporarily curtailed due to procedural problems." Kansas City offficials stated that delays or denials of state entitlements contribute to homelessness. Cuts in federal income assistance programs were specifically cited as a cause of homelessness by officials in Salt Lake City.

Substance Abuse/Lack of Services

Substance abuse, primarily alcoholism, was identified as a principal cause of homelessness in eight, or 31 percent, of the cities, including Charleston, Minneapolis, Nashville, Portland, Seattle, and Trenton. According to officials in San Francisco "cutbacks in federal subsidies for substance abuse treatment programs have not permitted any expansion of those services to the ever-growing number of homeless people who require assistance."

Family Crises/Domestic Violence

Another eight cities cited domestic violence as a major cause of the growing problem of homelessness. Among them are Detroit, San Antonio, San Juan, and Trenton. Norfolk officials identified increased family stress resulting from domestic violence and/or overcrowding living situations as contributing factor to the problem.

Population Shifts

Population shifts resulting from migration into the city from other areas of the nation and/or other countries were reported to have contributed to the problem of homelessness in five cities (19 percent) Norfolk, Portsmouth, Phoenix, San Antonio and San Juan. Phoenix, as in previous years, continues to experience an influx of people from other parts of the country who are drawn there by the city's relatively low unemployment rate and temperate climate. Homeless persons in San Juan include large numbers of undocumented immigrants, particularly from other countries in the Caribbean, as well as many others who migrate to the city from other parts of the island. In Norfolk, many of the women who come to the city when their partner (to whom they are not legally married) is stationed at the Navy base find themselves without any resources and often become homeless.

Evictions

An increase in the number of evictions, due primarily to an inability to pay rent, was also reported by five cities -- Detroit, Norfolk, Portsmouth, San Francisco and Washington, D.C. -- as a cause of homelessness. In Detroit, "there has been an increase in the number of evictions due to unemployment and domestic problems." Portsmouth officials indicated that evictions resulting from persons no longer being able to afford their rent or from overcrowding have contributed to the problem.

Overcrowding

An increase in the number of families and individuals who have moved in with friends and relatives because they are unable to maintain their own home has led to overcrowding conditions, which in turn have resulted in an increase in the number of homeless persons in four cities -- Norfolk, New York City, Portsmouth and Washington, D.C. New York City officials reported that "the State's Department of Social Services estimates that over 100,000 households double-up in existing housing. A study conducted in 1985 indicated that approximately 70 percent of the families coming into emergency housing had been doubling-up prior to becoming homeless."

Other factors identified by the city officials as contributing to the problem of homelessness include:

- cuts in federal assistance programs, by Detroit, Salt Lake City and Norfolk. Officials in Detroit stated that "serious cutbacks in a variety of federal programs have displaced the mentally ill and others who ordinarily would have resources and financial support."

- lack of supportive services for vulnerable populations, by New Orleans, and Trenton;

- poor money management skills, by San Francisco, Trenton, and Washington, D.C.

- the loss of homes as a result of fire, by Norfolk, Portsmouth and Trenton; and

- economic inequities, by Norfolk and Trenton.

CAPACITY

During the past year, the number of shelter beds increased in over three-fourths (77 percent) of the survey cities. The average incease was 16 percent, ranging from three percent in Chicago, 11 percent in Kansas City and Los Angeles, 20 percent in Detroit, Minneapolis, New Orleans and 27 percent in San Juan to 47 percent in Boston.

Three cities reported a decrease in the number of shelter beds available to homeless persons: Seattle (by four percent), Charleston (by 11 percent), and Phoenix (by 25 percent). Officials in Phoenix, however, noted that the decrease is due to a reduction in the number of occupants allowed at the city's outdoor shelter, to a total of 325.! The number of shelter beds did not change in another three cities -- Portsmouth, Salt Lake City, and San Antonio.

The number of individuals who, on an average night during the last year, were housed in emergency shelters varies considerably among the survey cities. In 13 of the survey cities, 200 or less individual family members were provided emergency shelter on a average night. Among those cities are Charleston, Cleveland, Providence, Phoenix, San Juan, and Trenton. In four cities -- Minneapolis, Portland, San Antonio and Seattle -- between 200 and 500 children and their parents slept in emergency shelters. Between 500 and 1,000 members of families were housed in emergency shelters in Boston, Los Angeles, Norfolk, and San Francisco. In Washington, D.C., approximately 1,083 children and their parents were provided emergency shelters; 1,976 in Philadelphia; and 13,760 in New York City.

In eight cities, including Trenton, Providence, San Juan, New Orleans and Cleveland, 200 or less homeless single adults were provided emergency shelter on an average night during the last year. In six other cities -- Charleston, Detroit, Minneapolis, Nashville, Phoenix and Saint Paul -- there were between 200 and 500 single individuals in shelters. In addition to the 427 individuals who were provided shelter in indoor facilities in Phoenix, 325 persons are allowed to sleep in the outdoor living facility that has been established for homeless persons in that city. In Louisville, Portland, Salt Lake City and San Antonio between 500 and 1,000 single adults were sheltered on a given night; and over 1,000 in Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York City, San Francisco, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C.

In more than half of the responding cities (56 percent), the number of children and their parents who were in transitional housing on an average

night during the last year totalled 100 or less. They include Boston, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Nashville, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, Seattle and San Antonio. Cities where more than 100 family members were housed in transitional housing include San Francisco, with 125 persons; Portland, with 149; Washington, D.C., with 417; Philadelphia, with 520; and New York City, with 4,079.

For single adults who were housed in transitional housing on an average night during the last year in the responding cities, the number of those served ranges from 12 in Nashville, 43 in Phoenix and 50 in Los Angeles to 130 in San Antonio and San Francisco and 181 in Boston.

Services Other than Emergency Shelters

In all 26 survey cities, services other than emergency shelter have been established to assist homeless people. The specific services available and the extent to which they are able to meet the need, however, vary significantly among the cities. Those services most often identified as being available in the cities, in rank order, are: mental health, health care, counseling, case management, housing assistance, transitional housing for mentally ill persons, outreach, job training, transitional housing for families, day centers for single adults, child day care and day centers for families. Most often, however, these services are not able to meet the needs of homeless persons. Those services which are the least able to meet the needs, also in rank order are: transitional housing for mentally ill individuals, transitional housing for families with children, mental health services, child day care, housing assistance, case management, outreach, day centers for single adults, day centers for families, counseling, job training, and health care. Officials in Los Angeles stated: "Although all of these services are available within our city, many exist only as model programs and are not widely available."

Mental Health/Health Care

Mental health services and health care are available in all survey cities. Sixteen cities (58 percent), including Charleston, Chicago, Kansas City, Louisville, Seattle and Trenton, reported that health care services are not able to meet the need. Portsmouth, one of the ten cities which reported meeting the health care needs of homeless persons, noted that only emergency health services are sufficiently available. Only two cities -- New York and Portsmouth -- reported that existing mental health services are able to meet the need. New York City officials indicated, however, that only emergency mental health services are sufficiently available to meet the needs of homeless people. "There is a shortage of long-term institutional and commmunity mental health beds in the city," they noted.

Counseling/Case Management

Counseling is the only service other than mental health and health care that has been established in all the survey cities to assist homeless persons. However, 77 percent of the cities indicated that counseling services are not sufficiently available to meet the need. Those cities include Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Portland, San Juan and Trenton. In all but one city, assistance in linking

with other needed services is provided to homeless persons through case management. However, 21 of those cities, or 84 percent, indicated that the need for case management is not being met.

Housing Assistance/Transitional Housing

Housing assistance is available to homeless persons in 24, or 92 percent of the cities. However, 88 percent of those cities, including Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Providence, Saint Paul, Seattle and Trenton, indicated that the housing assistance that is available in unable to meet the need.

Transitional housing for mentally ill homeless individuals is also available in 92 percent of the cities. Among them are Boston, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Saint Paul, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle and Washington, D.C. In none of the survey cities, however, is the need for this service being met.

Transitional housing for families was reported to be available in 20, or 77 percent of the cities, including Boston, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, New Orleans, New York City, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Providence, Saint Paul, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, Seattle and Trenton. Only one of those cities reported that the need for those types of facilities is being met. Trenton officials noted that the only transitional °°using program in the city serves teen-age mothers exclusively. In six cities -- Charleston, Detroit, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Providence, and San Juan -- there are no transitional housing facilities for homeless families with children.

Day Programs/Day Care

Day centers which serve single adults have been established in 19 cities. Among them are Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, New Orleans, New York, Nashville, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, and Seattle. Fifteen, or 79 percent of these cities, however, reported that existing day programs are not sufficient to meet the needs of single homeless persons. In response to this question, Salt Lake City officials noted that the local shelters recently began to be open 24-hours-a-day, but that a permanent day center is still needed.

Fourteen cities, including Cleveland, Los Angeles, Saint Paul, and Trenton, indicated that day centers have been established to serve homeless families. In some cases, however, these may be 24-hour shelters, rather than separate day time facilities. Seventy-nine percent of those cities said that the day programs that are available cannot meet the need.

In 18 cities, some form of child day care is available to homeless families. Those cities include Boston, Cleveland, Kansas City, New Orleans, New York City, Phoenix, Portland, Saint Paul, San Francisco, and Trenton. Eighty-nine percent of those cities, however, reported that they are not able to meet the need for child day care. In Chicago officials noted that day care is available to families in "transitional shelter" facilities only on an informal basis, in which parents make arrangements with other

residents or with staff so that they can look for jobs and/or permanent housing.

Outreach

Outreach services are available to assist homeless persons in 21 of the cities, including Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Louisville, New York City, Saint Paul, San Antonio and Seattle. Of those cities, 81 percent indicated that outreach services cannot meet the need.

Job Training

In 20 cities, or 77 percent, job training programs have been established to serve homeless persons. Among those cities are Charleston, Chicago, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Antonio and Trenton. In 70 percent of those cities job training programs can not meet the need.

Other Services

Other services available to homeless persons, in the survey cities include:

- literacy and adult education classes conducted in shelters, by San Antonio;
- transitional housing for employable men, in Saint Paul;
- a special education program for children in shelter facilities, in Salt Lake City;
- legal assistance, in Cleveland and San Juan;
- substance abuse programs, in Charleston, and Nashville; and,
- programs for homeless youth and veterans, in Cleveland;

Except for Saint Paul's transitional housing facility for men, none of the programs mentioned above are able to meet the need.

THE FUNDING

All 26 survey cities reported that the city governments have used their funds -- either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants -- to support local shelters or other services specifically for homeless persons. The funds come from a variety of sources:

- Twenty-two, or 85 percent, of the cities use locally generated revenues: Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, New York City, Nashville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Portsmouth, Saint Paul, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, San Juan, Seattle, Trenton and Washington, D.C.

- Eighteen cities, or 69 percent, use state grants: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, New York City, Norfolk, Nashville, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Saint Paul, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, Seattle and Trenton.

- Twenty-five of the survey cities use federal grants. Of these:

  * Nineteen cities use the Community Development Block Grant: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Portsmouth, Providence, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, San Juan, and Seattle.

  * The Community Services Block Grant is used by 13 cities: Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, New York City, Nashville, Phoenix, Portland, Providence, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Francisco and Seattle.

  * The Emergency Food and Shelter Program, administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, is used in 21 cities to provide shelter and other services to homeless individuals: Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Portland, Portsmouth, Providence, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle, and Trenton.

Among the other sources of funds listed by the cities are:

- HUD's Emergency Shelter Grant Program (first round) by Boston, Los Angeles, Louisville, New York City, Norfolk, Providence, Saint Paul, San Antonio, San Juan, Washington, D.C. and

- the Mayor's Fund for the Homeless, by San Francisco; and the Mayor's Emergency Relief Fund, by Detroit.

Every survey city has received funds or a commitment of funds under the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. According to officials of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, every survey city that was eligible for direct funding under the Emergency Shelter Grants Program has recieved a funding commitment. The only survey city that was not eligible is Charleston. Also according to HUD officials, Boston and Louisville received funding commitments under the first round of the Transitional Housing Demonstration Program and Louisville, New York City, Portland, Philadelphia, Phoenix, San Francisco, Seattle and Trenton have received funding commitments under the Section 8 SRO Moderate Rehabilitation Program. Information from the Department of Health and Human Services indicates that applications from 22 of the survey cities for the Health Services to the Homeless Program have been approved. Those cities include Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Kansas City, Saint Paul, Minneapolis, Trenton, Philadelphia, Louisville, New Orleans, and Seattle.

THE UNMET NEED FOR EMERGENCY SHELTER

On average, 23 percent of the demand for emergency shelter in the survey cities goes unmet. Estimates of unmet need range from seven percent in Chicago, 20 percent in Cleveland and Providence, 25 in Portland, 35 percent in New Orleans and San Francisco, 40 percent in Charleston, Los Angeles and Norfolk, 45 percent in Phoenix and Seattle, 58 percent in Kansas City, and 75 percent in Phoenix, to 98 percent in San Juan. Portland officials specifically mentioned that the reported percentage of unmmet demand refers primarily to homeless families who cannot be accommodated in existing shelters.

Nine cities -- Boston, Detroit, Minneapolis, New York City, Philadelphia, Saint Paul, Salt Lake City, San Antonio and Washington, D.C.! -- reported meeting the demand for emergency shelter. Several of those cities qualified their answers, however. Officials in San Antonio reported that there is currently underway a project to expand the number of shelter beds in the city in order to accommodate the growing number of homeless persons. "We hope that this will meet the increased demand," they noted. In Detroit, "those who are turned away from shelters are usually turned away because they are reluctant to abide by program's rules, i.e. they have substance abuse or alcohol problems. If a shelter is operating at full capacity, the Department of Social Services' protective services division is available to secure assistance in an emergency." Three cities -- New York City, Washington, D.C. and Philadelphia -- have official policies to provide shelter to all individuals in need who request assistance. Commenting on the City's ability to meet the demand for shelter, Philadelphia officials stated "when the demand increases beyond our current systems's ability to respond, public (city) facilities which are normally used for other purposes are converted into temporary emergency shelters until more long-term shelter alternatives can be found."

Sixty-five percent of the survey cities reported that emergency shelters have to turn away people in need because of lack of resources. Among the comments from the city officials:

> Los Angeles: "In-Fo-Line reported that it turned away 39 percent of those requesting emergency shelter for the first six months of 1987. A study entitled "The Short-Term Housing System of Los Angeles County," prepared by Shelter Partnership, Inc., in cooperation with United Way and the City of Los Angeles Redevelopment Agency, found that 'all sample shelters continuously operate at full capacity due to the shortage of sufficient beds to meet the needs of the homeless.'"
>
> Chicago: "There are still more homeless persons than shelter beds available."
>
> Seattle: "There is a lack of space and resources to meet the critical demand for emergency shelter."
>
> San Juan: "There are several reasons why emergency shelters must turn away people in need, including the fact that existing facilities are operating at full capacity and that those requesting assistance often do not meet the programs' eligibility requirements. There is also an

increasing number of men with AIDS (mostly drug addicts) who are excluded from services."

New Orleans: "Some homeless person are turned away if they have already used their free night which some shelters provide once in a three-month period. Homeless individuals are often unable to afford the fee which some of the shelters must charge in order to maintain their operation. Several of the area's churches will sponsor homeless individuals for an additional night. If possible, no one is turned away, but the available shelters are generally packed to capacity. During the city's freeze plan (when temperatures fall to 32 degrees Farenheit or below) no one is turned away."

Some of the cities specifically mentioned families with children as a group turned away from emergency shelters.

Portland: "An overflow network has been established for the shelter system (which primarily serves single adults) so that no one would be turned away when it is cold. However, no shelter is open during the day. There are also insufficient shelter facilities available to accommodate all the families in need. In addition, church shelters which serve families are only open during the night, and families have no place to go during the day."

Providence: "There are currently a limited number of units available for families in need of emergency shelter. As a result, we plan to expand our capacity to serve this at-risk population."

Cleveland: "Single men are turned away on cold winter nights due to lack of capacity. Women with children are occasionally turned away in the summer during the period of peak demand, also as a result of lack of space."

Norfolk: "The family shelter usually has a waiting list. We do not have enough beds to meet the requests for shelter which we receive, primarily due to lack of available space."

Phoenix: "Resources to assist homeless families with children and chronically mentally ill individuals are inadequate. Facilities that serve single, unattached men operate at full capacity during winter months, the peak demand period for emergency shelter."

HOMELESS PEOPLE IN PARTICULAR NEED OF ASSITANCE

Officials from the survey cities were asked to identify in order of need three specific groups of homeless people for whom emergency shelter or other needed services are particularly lacking in their city, as well as the services most needed by each of those groups. Families with children was identified as the group most in need by 17 of the responding cities (71 percent): Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Norfolk, Phoenix, Portland, Providence, Saint Paul, San Antonio, San Francisco, Seattle, Trenton and Washington, D.C. Another

three cities -- Louisville, Nashville and Philadelphia -- reported that families were the group second most in need of services.

Homeless mentally ill persons were ranked second as the group for whom emergency shelter and other needed services are particularly lacking by nine cities: Chicago, Cleveland, Kansas City, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Phoenix, Providence, Saint Paul and Washington, D.C. They were identified, however, as the group most in need of services by six other cities: Boston, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, Philadelphia, and San Juan.

Substance abusers, primarily alcoholics, were ranked third as the group lacking needed services by eight cities -- Charleston, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Nashville, Philadelphia, Providence, Saint Paul and San Francisco. They were identified by Boston and Minneapolis as second on the list of those most in need. Officials in Boston specifically identified individuals who have both mental illness and substance abuse problems.

Other groups of the homeless population were also ranked among the those most in need of services:

- Single women were identified as the second group most in need of services by six cities: Norfolk, Portland, Portsmouth, San Francisco, Seattle and Portland. Officials in Portland, however, noted that women with substance abuse and/or mental health problems are in particular need of services. Three other cities -- San Antonio, San Juan and Washington,D.C. -- listed single women third as the group particularly lacking services.

- Single men were ranked first by Portsmouth, second by San Francisco and Trenton, and third by Louisville, Mineapolis, New Orleans, Portland. Officials in Portland again indicated that single men, particularly those with mental illness and/or substance abuse problems, particularly lack the assistance they need.

- Unaccompanied youths were ranked second by San Juan and San Antonio, and third by Chicago, Kansas City, Phoenix and Portsmouth;

- Employed homeless persons were identified second as the group most in need by Charleston and third by Norfolk.

  Although they did not rank them in order of need, Norfolk and San Juan specifically mentioned homeless persons with AIDS as a group for whom needed services are particularly lacking.

Services Most Needed

City officials identified a wide range of services needed by the various groups of homeless people:

Families with Children

Emergency shelters, transitional housing and **child day care**, each cited by ten cities, were identified as the services most needed by homeless

families, but which are particularly lacking. The cities which reported the need for additional emergency shelters for homeless families include Charleston, Cleveland, Kansas City, New Orleans, Norfolk, Phoenix, Portland, and Trenton. Charleston officials noted the need for "long-term shelter appropriate for families." In Trenton more shelters are needed, including those which can provide "adequate sized arrangements" to accommodate homeless families. The need for transitional housing was specifically mentioned by Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, New Orleans, Phoenix, Portland, Saint Paul, San Antonio and Seattle. San Antonio officials noted that transitional housing is needed for families awaiting entitlement benefits or seeking permanent employment." The need for day care, to allow families to seek employment and housing opportunities, was identified by Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, New Orleans, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Portland, Seattle and Trenton.

Permanent housing affordable by low-income people was identified by nine cities as a service needed by homeless families but which is particularly lacking. Those cities are Chicago, Kansas City, Louisville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Seattle, Trenton, San Francisco and Washington, D.C. Officials in Philadelphia specifically cited the need for subsidized housing.

Employment services, including job training, counseling and placement, were identified by Cleveland, Louisville, New Orleans, Norfolk, Portland and Seattle. The need for **counseling** was reported by Chicago, Los Angeles, Louisville, Norfolk and Philadelphia. Los Angeles officials specifically mentioned the need for counseling and psychological services for children; officials in Philadelphia noted the need for intensive residential counseling for families.

Other services identified which are needed by homeless families and children but lacking include:

- **transportation**, by Kansas City, Norfolk, Portland and Seattle;
- **day shelters or centers**, by Portland and Seattle;
- **food**, by Norfolk and Trenton;
- **health care**, by Louisville and Norfolk;
- **case management**, by Los Angeles and Washington, D.C.
- **substance abuse programs**, by Portland and Trenton; and
- **legal advocacy**, by Norfolk.

Mentally Ill Persons

Transitional and permanent housing alternatives with supportive services lead the list of programs needed by homeless mentally ill persons but currently lacking in cities, with 15 cities reporting a lack of those services. Saint Paul, for example, cited the "need for transitional housing with special case management support services for this population." Other

cities which reported a lack of transitional housing needed by homeless mentally ill individuals include Trenton, Phoenix, San Juan, Washington, D.C., Cleveland and Los Angeles. Louisville officials stated that they "need more housing assistance,especially in the area of permanent group homes, to serve the growing numbers of mentally ill men and women." Among the other cities which specifically mentioned the need for group homes or half-way houses with on-site supportive services are Charleston, New Orleans and Washington, D.C. Officials in Kansas City noted the need for supervised permanent housing for persons with severe mental illness. Chicago officials reported that more "low-cost housing (SROs) and shared apartments with supportive services" are needed.

Six cities -- New Orleans, Norfolk, Phoenix, Philadelphia, San Juan and Saint Paul -- cited **emergency shelter** as a service needed by homeless mentally ill persons, but currently lacking. New Orleans and Norfolk specifically mentioned the need for emergency shelters which provide psychological evaluations and/or counseling. In Saint Paul "there is a need for more shelters where this population can live for at least a 30-day period."

Mental health services for homeless mentally ill individuals were cited as services particularly lacking by Los Angeles, Philadelphia, New Orleans, San Juan, and Trenton. Other services mentioned include **case management**, by Chicago, Los Angeles and Trenton; **outreach**, by San Juan and Trenton; **counseling**, particularly in the area of socialization and other living skills, by Los Angeles and San Juan; **job training and placement**, by San Juan, Cleveland and Portland; **day programs**, by Kansas City; and **clothing**, by San Juan.

Substance Abusers

Residential facilities, particularly those with on-site rehabilitative and other needed services, and **detoxification/treatment programs** were most frequently identified as those services needed by homeless individuals with substance abuse problems but which are lacking in cities. Five cities -- Boston, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C.! -- cited each of those services. Boston officials reported a need for "detox programs for homeless persons suffering from both mental illness and substance abuse." Cities which indicated that residential facilities with on-site services for substance abusers are particularly needed include Charleston, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Portland. Other needed services identifed include case management, by Los Angeles, Minneapolis and Saint Paul; outreach by Saint Paul; and jobs, by Portland.

Services Needed by Other Groups

Specific services needed by other groups of homeless persons which are lacking in cities were also identified:

Single women: emergency shelter, by Norfolk, San Antonio, San Juan, and Portsmouth; affordable permanent housing, by San Francisco, Seattle, San Juan; job training and/or placement, by Washington, D.C., Seattle, and San Juan; counseling, by Norfolk, and San Juan; tranportation, by Portland; outreach and clothing, by San Juan.

Single men: jobs and job training, by New Orleans, Minneapolis, Portland and Louisville; emergency shelters, by New Orleans, Portsmouth and Trenton; transitional and/or permanent housing, by New Orleans and San Francisco; food, by Trenton;

Employed individuals: affordable housing, by Charleston and Norfolk, health care, by Norfolk; transportation, by Charleston; affordable child care, by Norfolk; and counseling, by Charleston.

Unaccompanied youth: emergency, transitional and/or permanent housing, by Chicago, Kansas City, Phoenix, San Juan, and San Antonio. Chicago officials identified the need for "transitional shelters with specialized counseling in areas of living skills, parenting, and job training." In San Antonio "detention facilities are available. However, shelter space for numerous youth waiting to be emancipated is lacking." Other services needed by homeless youths but which are particularly lacking include advocacy, mental health, pregnancy counseling, education, outreach, and counseling.

Detroit and Salt Lake City identified various services needed by all homeless persons. Salt Lake City officials reported that jobs and job training, affordable housing and case management are particularly needed by all groups of homeless persons. Officials in Detroit indicated that, in addition to transitional housing for homeless families (the group most in need in that city) all groups of homeless persons need additional support services, including education and job training and day care. Convalescent care is needed but lacking for those homeless individuals recovering from illness or recent hospitalization; men and women over 55 years of age also need a more protective environment, they noted.

THE OUTLOOK

Twenty four of the cities, or 92 percent, expect the demand for emergency shelter to increase in 1988. Two cities -- Louisville and Saint Paul -- indicated that they expect the demand for shelter to stay the same. Saint Paul officials noted "the transitional housing alternatives we have available and recently provided single room occupancy units are helping move some of the homeless persons into the maintream." According to officials in Louisville, local "statistics show that the number of homeless people is staying about the same as last year. If the grant applications we have submitted under the Steward McKinney Homeless Assistance Act are approved, we wil have sufficient units to meet the demand. However, we are finding it extremely costly to operate these facilities, especially if supportive services which are critical in making these individuals self-sufficient are provided." In none of the survey cities is the problem of homelessness expected to decrease next year.

Reasons given for the expected increase in the demand for emergency shelter include:

Chicago: "There has been no significant improvement in the economic status of the city's poor and near poor and no increase in available low-income housing."

Portland: "Economically, things are becoming worse for very low-income, low-skilled people. There are insufficient entry level jobs available, and the low-paying jobs do not provide sufficient income to suport a family. In addition, federal funding reductions continue to have a drastic impact on marginal people."

Trenton: "Development of permanent housing is not keeping pace with the demand, and the availability of low-income housing is decreasing. Economic and inflationary pressures are forcing the poor and other vulnerable people out of the housing market."

Washington, D.C.: "As market rents continue to skyrocket, and federal support for vital 'safety net' programs continue to decrease, we can expect a rise in the number of poor and working poor families and individuals joining the ranks of the homeless population."

New Orleans: "Cuts in federal assistance programs, poor housing conditions in the city, and the inability of many families to continue supporting each other will continue to result in an increase in homeless persons."

Los Angeles: "The demand far exceeds the availability of emergency shelters. At the same time, City data indicates that poverty will continue to increase. In addition, the loss of existing housing stock due to housing that does not meet seismic safety standards, as well as buyouts of HUD subsidized housing (i.e., apartments that will be converted to market rate rental if owners prepay their mortgages) will increase the number of homeless persons."

Norfolk: "High rents, the demolition of low-income housing which are not being replaced, and evictions of persons already on a low or fixed income as a result of the closing of low-income housing will lead to an increase in homelessness. Also, until the criminal justice system better meets the needs of victims of domestic violence, the number of battered women who are homeless will increase."

Philadelphia: "Due to multiple factors, including the reduction and elimination of low-cost housing subsidies, homelessness has increased by approximatelay 25 percent each year for the last six or seven years, and is expected to continue to increase in the next year."

Salt Lake City: "The number of homeless persons needing services, shelter, housing, food, clothing, etc., continues to increase by approximately 20 percent per year."

Phoenix: "The city's nationally publicized relatively low unemployment rates and mild winter weather will continue to attract persons from other parts of the country that are economically depressed, particularly Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas."

Detroit: "Recently announced lay-offs in the automotive industry... will exacerbate the factors which contribute to the problem of homelessness. In addition, if benefit levels and the low-income housing stock are not increased, the problem will continue to grow."

Charleston: "Unfortunately, trends indicate a steady increase in the number of homeless persons. And an unstable national economy won't help."

Boston: "Very little has changed to eliminate the causes of homelessness -- deinstitutionalization, inadequate welfare benefits, federal cuts in housing programs. The federal government must renew its commitment to affordable housing in order for the supply to increase sufficiently."

Portsmouth: "Due to a loss of employment and the lack of affordable housing for low-income persons, requests for emergency shelter are expected to increase."

San Antonio: "Unless there is an improvement in the causes of homelessness, there will continue to be an increase in the number of homeless persons."

San Francisco: "Conditions which contribute to the problem of homelessness, such as the shortage of low-cost housing, inadequate levels of public assistance benefits and minimum wages, and the lack of services needed by persons with mental illness and substance abuse problems, are not expected to improve. In fact, they will probably worsen."

Kansas City: "The need for emergency shelter is likely to increase until the causal factors are fully addressed. However, a more important need which is growing is the need for programs which assist the homeless in achieving economic stability and permanent housing. Thus, emergency shelter is being replaced as a priority in this community, by transitional housing and related services."

Nashville: "Some local agencies serving homeless persons report 'ever increasing' waiting lists for their services. Other agencies indicate that some of the services needed to enable homeless persons to re-enter the mainstream of community life are not available to the degree needed to address adequately the problems which create or contribute to homelessness."

CITY DATA ON HOMELESSNESS

	PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY SHELTER	PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN # OF FAMILIES	PERCENTAGE COMPOSITION OF HOMELESS POPULATION							ARE PEOPLE TURNED AWAY	
			FAMILIES	SINGLE MEN	SINGLE WOMEN	YOUTH (a)	MENTALLY ILL	SUBSTANCE ABUSERS	WORKING	YES	NO
BOSTON	10	10	20	65	15	0	32	29	25/10(b)		X
CHARLESTON	23	144	27	70	3	0	20	30	30	X	
CHICAGO	7	--	40	40	20	0	25	20	30	X	
CLEVELAND	10	20	13	66	16	5	10	--	6	X	
DETROIT	15	15	40	35	23	2	9(c)	30	--		X
KANSAS CITY	44	3	43	29	22	6	30	16	35	X	
LOS ANGELES	25	40	30	45	15	10	27	27	10	X	
LOUISVILLE	0	0	15	75	10	0	40	40	10		
MINNEAPOLIS	20	--	16	80	4	0	40	50	5		X
NASHVILLE	23	--	18	53	18	11	14	23	28	X	
NEW ORLEANS	20	--	20	60	10	10	35	30	15	X	
NEW YORK CITY	16	18	63	33	4	0	25	30	--		X
NORFOLK	17	30	35	50	15	0	--	--	--	X	
PHILADELPHIA	40	66	33	43	24	0	20	60	25		X
PHOENIX	15	10	25	70	5	0	20	20	20	X	
PORTLAND	12	15	52	31	12	5	20	60	--	X	
PORTSMOUTH	--	--	60	27	13	0	--	--	--	X	
PROVIDENCE	30	75	65	20	11	4	20	30	20	X	
SAINT PAUL	8	2	33	47	20	0	23	30	13		X
SALT LAKE CITY	20	20	30	60	10	0	25	30	25		X
SAN ANTONIO	7	20	30	52	4	14	--	--	54		X
SAN FRANCISCO	25	--	20	45	32	3	45	45	10	X	
SAN JUAN	35	25	24	53	3	20	50	50	39	X	
SEATTLE	25	--	30	55	10	5	40	40	30	X	
TRENTON	15	15	50	35	15	0	10	40	10	X	
WASHINGTON, DC	30	40	23	51	26	0	18	--	65/11(b)		X

(a) Data on homeless youth is often not separated from those on single adults. Zero percentage does not necessarily mean that there are no homeless youth in the city.

(b) 25% single adults; 10% members of families; 65% single adults; 11% members of families.

(c) Includes only homeless individuals with documented history of mental illness.

HOUSING

During 1987 the demand for assisted housing by low-income households increased in 84 percent of the survey cities, by an average of 26 percent. It stayed the same in four cities, and decreased in none. The average wait for assisted housing in the survey cities is nearly two years, and in 65 percent of the cities waiting lists for assisted housing programs have been closed. One-third of eligible low-income households in the survey cities are currently being served by assisted housing. With the decline in federally-assisted housing programs, none of the survey cities expect to be able to meet the housing needs of low-income households in the foreseeable future.

THE DEMAND

The demand for assisted housing by low-income households increased in 21 of the survey cities during 1987. Four cities -- New York City, Phoenix, Salt Lake City and Washington, D.C. -- reported that it remained the same. No city reported a decrease in demand. The average percent of the increase in demand was 26 percent, ranging from 10 percent in Cleveland, Louisville, Nashville, San Antonio and San Francisco to 30 percent in Kansas City, Los Angeles, and San Juan.

The average wait from the time of application for assisted housing until an applicant actually receives assistance in the survey cities is 22 months. The wait ranges from three to six months in Portland and six to 18 in Kansas City to 24 months or more in Charleston, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, and Trenton. Several cities commented that the length of the wait depends on the type of housing requested. Chicago officials noted a 10-year wait for Section 8; Washington, D.C. an eight-year wait for family housing.

Waiting lists for assisted housing have been closed in 65 percent of the cities due to their extensive length. These cities are Charleston, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, Phoenix, Portland, Portsmouth, Providence, Saint Paul, San Juan, San Antonio, San Francisco and Seattle. Five of these cities -- Kansas City, Louisville, Nashville, Portland and Seattle -- noted that the lists had been closed for Section 8 assistance only. In Saint Paul, the list for larger units had been closed.

THE CAPACITY

The city officials identified a number of locally-designed housing innovations aimed at assisting low-income people which are currently underway. An annotated listing of them is included in the Appendix.

Across the survey cities one-third of the eligible low-income households are currently being served by assisted housing. This ranges from five percent in Los Angeles, 10 percent in Philadelphia, 13 percent in Detroit

and Providence and 15 percent in Minneapolis and San Antonio to 50 percent in Nashville, Salt Lake City and Washington, D.C., 60 percent in Kansas City and 63 percent in Boston. Seattle officials noted that 70 percent of the low-income elderly are served by assisted housing in their city.

THE OUTLOOK

Given the decline in federal housing assistance, none of the 26 survey cities expects that local housing programs will be able to meet the housing needs of low-income households in the future. Explaining their responses, the city officials said:

Boston: "Despite assistance from state government and our locally-developed programs, the increasing levels of demand for housing assistance and escalating housing costs will constrain the City of Boston from meeting the total need for low-income housing."

Charleston: "Our waiting list for housing assistance is excessively long. Federal funds for new construction have been drastically reduced. Funds to maintain existing housing stock also have been cut. The city does not have money to renovate many of the units and, as a result, they often are sold and do not remain affordable by their current tenants."

Chicago: "Despite city leverage, programs cannot meet the true low-income housing needs of the over 200,000 families currently living in inappropriate housing."

Detroit: "Approximately 77,000 households are determined eligible for assisted housing under the Housing Assistance Plan."

Kansas City: "Over 41,000 households in Kansas City are competing to live in just under 25,000 housing units available for rent at $125 per month or below. Over 22,000 households cannot afford their current living arrangements.

"Local housing programs do not have the capacity to develop the estimated 18,000 low-income units needed in this city. Given the continued generosity and willingness of private developers to enter into partnerships with the public sector, their efforts will, at best, result in small (40 to 80 unit) developments for low- and moderate-income housing. Governmental subsidies are clearly needed for the development and maintenance of housing for very low and no-income persons. The private sector cannot be realistically expected to support such housing completely.

"Federal attention to the issue of homelessness must shift from the establishment of emergency shelters to the development of decent, affordable housing for the very poor."

Los Angeles: "The limited number of existing units, the limited production of new units, the demolition of existing units, the loss of units to buyouts (low-income units converted to market rate rentals if

owners prepay their mortgages) and the nonexistence of funding mechanisms in the private market insure that the housing needs of low-income households will not be met in the near future."

Louisville: "Affordable housing is a critical issue in our community. It is of dire importance that the federal government realize that subsidized housing is its responsibility and a vital need in most urban areas."

Minneapolis: "Local resources cannot make up for the loss of federal funds."

Nashville: "There are no local housing subsidies to replace those lost through federal housing assistance."

New Orleans: "The demand for public housing is constantly increasing. Even some of the existing housing is being lost because of the cost of repairs; more than 100 units were recently lost. Federal, state and local funding is being cut back."

New York City: "The Mayor's 10-year, $4.2 billion housing plan will attempt to make up for some of the loss of federal housing funds. In no way can this local effort, however, be a complete substitute for federal housing assistance. In addition, it is being done at great cost to the City, diverting resources from other critical needs."

Norfolk: "There is no available, affordable housing for low-income residents except through Section 8, and the waiting list for Section 8 is 24 to 36 months."

Phoenix: "The decline in federal housing assistance has made a major impact on the need for affordable housing which is beyond the ability of local resources to meet."

Portland: "We cannot meet the need now, how can we do so in the future with fewer resources?"

Providence: "Real estate values have quadrupled in the last two years, reducing the availability of affordable housing for low-income housing and raising rents above affordable levels."

Salt Lake City: "Local government's resources are limited. The national commitment to housing and other programs for low-income persons needs to be increased."

San Antonio: "There is very little construction of low-income housing by the private sector because there is no margin of profit in the construction of this type of housing."

Trenton: "Housing programs cannot match clients with housing. The City of Trenton has over 95 percent of the county's poverty population, which is increasing annually. Housing programs are loosing subsidies and the rental market is geared towards more affluent tenants."

CITY DATA ON HOUSING

CITY	ASSISTED HOUSING DEMAND IN 1987	AVERAGE WAIT IN MONTHS	STOPPED ACCEPTING APPLICATIONS YES	STOPPED ACCEPTING APPLICATIONS NO	PERCENT LOW-INCOME HOUSE HOLDS SERVED
BOSTON	increased	(a)		x	63
CHARLESTON	increased	24+	x		40
CHICAGO	increased	(b)	x		45
CLEVELAND	increased	12		x	85
DETROIT	increased	14		x	13
KANSAS CITY	increased	6-18	x(c)		60
LOS ANGELES	increased	24	x		5
LOUISVILLE	increased	36	x(c)		na
MINNEAPOLIS	na	12	x		15
NASHVILLE	increased	36	x(c)		50
NEW ORLEANS	increased	24-48	x		25
NEW YORK CITY	same	na		x	na
NORFOLK	increased	na		x	40
PHILADELPHIA	increased	12-48		x	10
PHOENIX	same	4-36	x		20
PORTLAND	increased	3-6	x(c)		38
PORTSMOUTH	increased	18	x		na
PROVIDENCE	increased	24	x		na
SAINT PAUL	increased	na	x		na
SALT LAKE CITY	same	18		x	50
SAN JUAN	increased	na	x		30
SAN ANTONIO	increased	12-36	x		15
SAN FRANCISCO	increased	30	x		na
SEATTLE	increased	5-24	x(c)		(d)
TRENTON	increased	24-36		x	25
WASHINGTON, DC	increased	(e)		x	50

(a) Varies by type
(b) Section 8, 10 years, otherwise varies by type
(c) Have stopped accepting applications for Section 8 only
(d) 44% for families, 70% for elderly
(e) 12 months for elderly, 96 months for families

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Seventy-two percent of the survey cities reported that the number of poor people increased during 1987. At the same time the unemployment situation improved in 12 cities (48 percent), stayed the same in nine cities (36 percent) and worsened in four. While nearly two-thirds of the survey cities (64 percent) reported that they had benefited generally from the national economic recovery, 81 percent said that the economic recovery had not helped hungry, homeless or other poor people.

POVERTY

The city officials reported that the number of poor people increased in 18 of the survey cities, or 72 percent. These cities are Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, Norfolk, Phoenix, Portland, Providence, Salt Lake City, San Juan, San Francisco, Seattle and Trenton. Philadelphia cited a decrease in the number of poor people; six cities said the number remained the same.

The city officials identified several different indicators of the increase in the number of poor people. Most frequently cited was an increased demand for basic services including food, shelter, social services, by Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, Phoenix, Portland, San Francisco and Trenton. The high cost of housing or increased demand for housing assistance were listed as indicators by Boston, Portland, New Orleans, Providence and San Juan. Other factors cited were an increased public assistance caseload, increased food stamp caseload, and increased homelessness.

The New Poor

In commenting on what has happened to the new poor during the last year, city officials primarily cited the complex nature of the new poor population and their difficulty in coping with the social services system and in obtaining new, appropriate employment.

> Charleston: This group is increasing rapidly. They defy labels: Some are deinstitutionalized mentally ill persons, some are on SSI. Some are young males with low job skills. Some are single-parent families awaiting either employment or public assistance. They often end up living in shelters."

> Kansas City: "This group has grown to include persons who were previously marginal. They include persons displaced by plant closings, and those whose marginal incomes (public assistance, child support, minimum wages) could not keep pace with rising costs for shelter, food, clothing and medical care. The new poor have also experienced high frustration levels in that poverty is a 'new' experience and has mental as well as economic impacts for them. Those working with the 'new poor' are likewise frustrated by the fact that they often 'fall between the

cracks' of various social service support program eligibility criteria."

Los Angeles: "The new poor became the old poor, some became the minimum wage, working poor. Twenty-six percent of the influx of poor from other states came from the four 'oil bust' states -- Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisana and Texas -- according to a survey of two inner city emergency shelters operated by the City of Los Angeles during the winter months of 1986-87."

Louisville: "This group is finding it difficult to get into the system to seek emergency assistance and/or human services. It is also difficult for them to find employment, and if they do so it is usually at minimum wage."

New Orleans: "People from upper income jobs, who suddenly found themselves unemployed or retired with the reduction in staff of several oil companies locally, have at this point either moved out of New Orleans to look for work in some other area of the country, have accepted lower paying positions in another field, or have become a part of the hard-core unemployed or underemployed."

Norfolk: "The problem of a lack of adequate, affordable housing affects each of these groups. The percent of family income spent on shelter is constantly increasing, leaving very little money to meet other needs. The new poor have been rejected for public assistance because of strict regulations. They have gone to the streets or shelters, or become names on waiting lists. Some are being served by a shelter and are making constructive steps toward self-sufficiency, but the largest percentage are still in need."

Phoenix: "This group is experiencing, for the fist time, what it means to be dependent upon the social welfare system. They find the red tape and eligibility determination cumbersome, frustrating, and demeaning. This group is very vocal regarding the inadequacy of the system."

Portland: "The new poor should have been doing better during the past year, with the increased activity in the economy. More jobs are available and people who were recently unemployed should be able to find new employment, if not at the same wage as their former employment."

San Antonio: "Many families in this category have to seek assistance from social service agencies. Many families have lost their homes to foreclosure. Foreclosure and bankruptcies have increased."

San Francisco: "Many are relying on social service agencies for the first time in their lives, and are frustrated and confused by that 'turn' in their lives. Cutbacks in social service funds have severely impacted on the ability to respond to the growing demand for those services."

San Juan: "The increase in the unemployment rate, together with the lack of education and job skills, creates a new poor population which

needs support assistance from the government because they have no available income for housing, food and other basic needs."

Seattle: "All populations, whether 'newly homeless,' working and living in a shelter, or chronically poor, are facing the same cycles and obstacles of poverty. These factors include minimum wage jobs, lack of sufficient income, lack of affordable and appropriate housing and homelessness caused by crisis and economic conditions."

Trenton: "The new poor are struggling to compete in an upscale economic and inflationary climate where basic needs are being pulled out of their reach."

The Working Poor

Many survey cities reported that the working poor have a very difficult time making ends meet, often need public assistance to supplement their wages, and sometimes are ineligible for benefits and other needed services:

Boston: "The working poor, if not currently residing in regulated housing, were particularly hard-pressed by the continued swell in condominium conversions and the economic consequences of this real estate transaction....In response to the conversion problem, Mayor Flynn has instituted a system of protections for low- and moderate-income and elderly persons."

Charleston: "The numbers are growing. They are often young, unskilled workers, seasonally employed workers, or single-parent families. They move between dependency and self-sufficiency, often needing assistance."

Kansas City: "The working poor are also vulnerable to the economic and social conditions of the community. They are increasingly applying for emergency assistance as they attempt to maintain a certain level of independence and self-sufficiency. However, most are finding themselves falling further and further behind. Temporary or permanent layoffs are more likely for them, and they are likely to join the ranks of the 'new poor' when such occurs."

Louisville: "In our city a family of three needs at least $7.00 per hour to meet their basic needs. Many of the working poor make considerably less."

Los Angeles: "It became more difficult to pay the rent. The cost of living increased."

New Orleans: "The working poor have not experienced many changes in New Orleans in the past year. While wages in the lower paid jobs of the services industry have not increased during the past year, the cost of goods in this area has also remained stable. Those individuals who have been forced out of their occupations of choice, due to changes in the job market, have been unable to find work at comparable wages, and have been forced to take positions in the low-skilled, low-paying

service sector. This has caused a further difficulty for those low-skilled individuals, particularly teenagers, who traditionally have held these positions."

Norfolk: The working poor are experiencing "more stress and, therefore, more domestic violence. Housing and cost-of-living increases are not matched by wage increases. There has been a decrease in low-income housing and an increase in service jobs that only pay minimum wage."

Philadelphia: "Marginal and minimum wage employment have become more available. The gap between the cost of available housing, however, and the capacity to pay has also expanded. Consequently, more persons in the shelter systems are working but cannot afford to leave the shelters."

Phoenix: "In many instances, the working poor are the most deprived. They are not entitled to many benefits because they are employed. For example, a working mother does not receive subsidized day care. Because the system does not support the working poor, there is little hope that they will ever escape poverty."

Portland: "The working poor are not doing any better than last year. The cost of living has not dropped and low wages have not risen."

Portsmouth: "These persons still receive minimum wages and continually depend upon assistance from public and private agencies."

San Antonio: "A large percentage of persons in this category require some type of public assistance on a regular basis. There is minimal expectancy among the working poor that their situation can be improved."

San Francisco: "High, and constantly rising, costs of rent, food, shelter and clothing have reached a level far in excess of the income of the working poor. The working poor are constantly losing ground in their battle to survive -- this often leads to a deterioration of their mental health and family interactions."

Trenton: "The working poor are put in direct competition with other low-income groups, but are many times ineligible for subsidies."

The Chronic Poor

City officials commented on the inability of the chronic poor to break out the of the cycle of poverty, and their growing disaffection with society:

Boston: "The chronic poor have continued to suffer from the loss of federal supports -- ranging from decreased job training efforts, to curtailed surplus food distribution. This group has also suffered by the country's failure to undertake any major new domestic initiatives, such as nationally sponsored child care which would enable chronically poor families to find safe environments for their young children while

they enter training and the workforce. In Boston, with the continued rise in basic costs of housing, food and clothing, the chronic poor, in particular families and children, have increasingly joined the ranks of the homeless and the hungry."

Charleston: "Role models were often chronically poor. They rely on public assistance. Their situation is sadly predictable. They depend on agencies and institutions to meet their needs, and find that an acceptable life style."

Kansas City: "The support system has continued to support this group, but the comprehensive system overhaul which would be required to move them out of poverty does not exist. The chronic poor are victimized by no or inadequate job training, which limits their employment opportunities. They often have physical and mental health problems, and are relatively immobile. Social service systems have prioritized their limited resources to alleviate immediate suffering rather than to address longer term solutions."

Louisville: "These individuals continue to move into a lower economic strata because they now are in competition with the new and working poor."

Minneapolis: The chronic poor have grown, "with a third generation in poverty and the in-migration of unemployed people from the urban ghettos of the South and the Midwest."

New Orleans: "The chronic poor have faced worsening conditions in the the last year. While more attention has been paid to this group through social service programs, state, federal and local budget cuts have adversely impacted all health and social program delivery systems, as well as cash available to the poor. The chronic poor are often functionally illiterate and unskilled, which make employment extremely hard to find. Housing availability is also limited for this group, which often results in multiple family households in public housing. The chronic poor may be growing younger in New Orleans with the increase in teenage pregnancies."

Norfolk: The chronic poor include "more of the street people, living in boxes and sleeping in parks. There has been burn-out among public assistance workers who tire of providing services to the chronic poor, who then receive lower quality services. There has been more domestic violence, because there has been more stress."

Phoenix: "This group has developed a dependency on the system as a way of life. They are knowledgeable about entitlement programs, and have learned to use them to their benefit. The system does not facilitate or reward any movement toward self-sufficiency, except through special projects."

Portland: "The situation of the chronic poor has remained essentially the same. Although programs for the homeless have continued to provide services and opportunities for those with the desire to work their way out of homelessness, the ranks of the homeless continue to swell."

Portsmouth: "Lack of training, job skills and education make this group more prone to remaining in need of assistance."

San Antonio: "The chronic poor require a great deal of assistance with little expectation that their situation will ever change."

San Francisco: "The 'spiraling downward syndrome' is intensified for this group. The ability to improve the conditions of their lives diminishes everyday for them. This further impacts on their alienation and disaffiliation with a 'society' in which they no longer hold 'membership.'"

Trenton: "The chronic poor are also the chronically homeless, fast becoming disassociated from the mainstream of society. Many of these people are undereducated and vulnerable, such as the severely mentally ill, the elderly and children."

Poverty Case Studies

Officials in the survey cities were asked to provide a brief case study which describes the conditions faced by a family or individual in poverty in their city:

CHARLESTON -- A TWO-PARENT FAMILY

"The husband is a construction worker injured on the job, but not covered by workmen's compensation and ineligible for unemployment compensation. The wife and two children are eligible for AFDC ($199 a month) and food stamps after the husband's temporary disability is medically documented and applications are processed (six to eight weeks).

"The family falls behind on the rent and is evicted from their home. They go into one shelter and become ineligible for AFDC and food stamps because they lack a 'stable home.' When the shelter's seven-day limit arrives they must move on to another shelter. The family stays with relatives during the day, sleeping at the shelter at night.

"Finally, when the situation becomes too intolerable, the family splits up and stays with two different sets of relatives. When the husband is able to return to work -- four months after his injury occurred -- the family begins to look for their own home."

CHICAGO -- AN UNEMPLOYED, SINGLE MOTHER

A typical poor family in Chicago is headed by a minority, youth-adult female with two or three children. She is one of the hard-core unemployed and has not worked in 18 months or more. She has been unemployed because of a lack of skills, illness or a lack of child care. She receives various government benefits, but still has an income of less than half of the poverty line. Her needs include emergency food, child care, employment training, housing and energy assistance."

KANSAS CITY -- THREE GENERATIONS

"A female head of household, age 56, her son and his two children applied for emergency utility assistance after the son suffered a job-related injury, disabling him for several weeks. He was not covered by workmen's compensation or sick leave benefits. The only income in the home was an $80 per month general relief check, received by the head of household, who also had serious health problems. The household had pending food stamp and ADC applications, but due to a long delay in processing these applications, the family was in a truly desperate situation and could expect to remain that way for an indefinite period."

LOS ANGELES -- AN AFDC MOTHER

"Dee is a black woman, 28, with three children, ages nine, seven and three. Dee's primary means of support is AFDC. She was living in a housing authority complex, but moved because of the environment. 'We had drug dealers in every apartment and gangs that would terrorize us. I had to move,' she said. She moved in with her sister-in-law just outside of Los Angeles County. It was safe, but there were seven children and two adults living in a two-bedroom apartment. She left after three months. She saved money, but not enough. She moved several times after that, sometimes living with family, friends or strangers. Bit by bit she saved $400 from her AFDC checks, however, all her hard work disappeared when she was robbed by drug-user friends of the women she was staying with. She was hit on the head with an iron. By the time she was stitched up, she had no food, no money and nowhere to go. The doctor's office called In-Fo-Line for her. They found her a room and the doctor gave her the money for the bus. While Dee wanted very much to stabilize her housing situation, she expected to remain on AFDC. Even if she had been able to find a job, she had no one to watch her children, and her oldest son had a serious case of sickle cell anemia."

LOUISVILLE -- A SINGLE-PARENT, WELFARE FAMILY

"A typical family living in poverty in Louisville might be a single mother and two children. This size family can expect to receive $197 in AFDC benefits and $211 worth of food stamps a month. The market rate for a three-bedroom apartment is $395; even a sub-standard, below-market apartment of the same size will likely rent for at least $225.! Obviously, without subsidized housing it is literally impossible for this family to meet the most basic living expenses."

NEW ORLEANS -- A SINGLE-PARENT FAMILY, INELIGIBLE FOR WELFARE

"A mother with two children, ages six and 13, who was eight months pregnant, lost her state position in May. In August, she received a $2800 retirement check, which was mainly used to pay back money that she borrowed to survive. She was honest and told her welfare worker that she had received this check. The welfare worker denied her benefits until April, 1988. In the meantime, the mother has tried to commit suicide, and her children are hungry. Even with rent assistance of $265, she is not able to provide for her family. The woman is receiving food and a lot of support and advocacy services. Eventually she will need to move in with relatives until April, when the welfare payments start up again. She has been referred to

the job search program for a sitter's position, but it is unlikely that she will be hired."

NORFOLK -- A PREGNANT MOTHER WITH TWO CHILDREN

"Jane Doe, age 22, is pregnant, has two small children, no pre-natal care. She was abandoned by an abusive husband with no financial support and has no relatives nearby. Jane has a ninth grade education and no work experience outside the home. It will take 45 days to receive public assistance after she applies, but ADC will not even cover the rent on her apartment."

NORFOLK -- A TWO-PARENT FAMILY

"In a two-parent family with one spouse working, the spouse was fired, and the wife gave birth to their sixth child. Based on the former employer's refusal to verify income, the family was ineligible for food stamps. It had no medical coverage. The husband went back to school; the family lives on VA benefits. The school-age children needed clothes and supplies. The wife had no employable skills. Pride was an issue with this family."

PHILADELPHIA -- A MOTHER WITH THREE CHILDREN EVICTED

Mary Jones and her three children were evicted from public housing because of failure to pay rent. They are now living in the city-funded shelter system at a cost of $52 per day, waiting for a public housing unit. The primary cause of the family's failure to pay rent was insufficient income to meet the costs of feeding, clothing and transporting the family. Payment of rent can be perceived as a less immediate need than other necessities."

PHOENIX -- A TWO-PARENT FAMILY MUST BREAK UP

Mr. and Mrs. X and their three small children moved to Phoenix from Ohio. Both are unemployed. They had enough money to get a small apartment. Mr. X has been actively seeking employment for several months, but was unable to obtain steady employment which would allow him to support the family. Therefore, Mr. X left the family in order to enable them to get AFDC, which they were not eligible for as long as he was in the home."

PORTLAND -- A HOMELESS FAMILY

"A family which finds itself homeless with no resources is placed in a church shelter for as long as it needs shelter. The family receives case management from a neighborhood-based social service agency and prepares a plan for getting out of their homeless situation. The shelter provides food for the evening meal and the following morning. During the day, however, the family leaves the shelter and is on its own, hopefully looking for work, following-up on interviews, making contacts to obtain services such as welfare and SSI. The older children are registered in the local elementary school, using the church address as home. The younger children are on the streets with the parents. If the family qualifies, they will be placed in transitional housing after a couple of weeks in the shelter. They then

would have longer-term housing and case management to help them break the cycle."

PORTSMOUTH -- AN EVICTED, SINGLE MOTHER WITH FOUR CHILDREN

"One mother of four children on ADC assistance could not pay her rent and was subsequently evicted. She tried to find public and private agencies to place her in new housing. However, she was in need of utility and rental deposits and moving expenses totalling $700, and funds were not available. Lack of sufficient income prevents her from maintaining any permanent, affordable residence. Subsidized housing is not available. She and her children are now at the PARC Place shelter until relocation is made."

SAINT PAUL -- A SINGLE MAN

"Bob, 26, is from Wisconsin. He went to school and became a registered nurse. He was working at a hospital and due to funding cuts he was laid off. He had an old car and drove to the Twin Cities looking for work, and his car broke down. He had no money to have it fixed and no way to look for work. Some of the interviews were across town at 5:30. If he took a bus and came back, he'd be out in the street because they lock the doors of the shelter at 7:00 -- no exceptions."

SAINT PAUL -- A BATTERED WIFE

"Mary was raped and had to leave home out of fear. She has two children, and nothing but AFDC payments to help her start all over again. If it had not been for the shelter, she would probably have returned to the same place and possibly suffered a second attack. 'There were no other choices," she said."

SAN ANTONIO -- A HOMELESS, SINGLE FATHER WITH THREE CHILDREN

"The family consists of a 31-year-old Hispanic male with three children, aged five, three and two. The father lost his job several months ago and the family moved in with relatives temporarily. The children's mother died recently. The father was unable to find employment and the relatives were not financially able to continue to support this family so they moved to a shelter. Social workers are attempting to find employment for the father, but have been unable, so they are still at the shelter."

SAN FRANCISCO -- A SKILLED, TWO-PARENT, HOMELESS FAMILY

"The mother has a Ph.D. in astrophysics. The father was a computer operator for 25 years. The father lost his job due to staff cutbacks. They used up their savings while he looked for a job, but he was unable to locate new work in his field because he was unable to compete with younger workers with skills more recent and up-to-date than his, and who had college degrees which he did not have. The mother was unable to find employment due to the highly technical nature of her training. They are living in an emergency family shelter while being processed for AFDC."

SAN JUAN -- A HOMELESS, DRUG ADDICT

"A single, young man, 28 years of age with a drug addiction problem, is living in an abandoned car. He's unemployed and receives no income. He doesn't qualify for food stamps because he doesn't have a residence. He has physical and mental health problems, too. His family's address is unknown."

SEATTLE -- A HOMELESS COUPLE

"A couple in their early forties called the FPA shelter for assistance. They are from the King County area and both are unemployed. As single adults who are capable of employment, they are ineligible for public assistance. They have been working odd jobs and going to missions for their meals. As there are very few shelters in Seattle and King county that provide couples with emergency housing, they have been living in their car off and on for several weeks."

EMPLOYMENT

Officials in all but two of the survey cities (92 percent) indicated that the official unemployment rate for their city does not reflect the actual unemployment problem. The explanation most frequently given for this -- the fact that unemployment statistics do not include discouraged workers -- was cited by 11 cities: Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Phoenix, Portland, Providence, San Antonio and San Francisco. Factors of underemployment, such as part-time employment and low wage jobs, were listed by Kansas City, Louisville, and New Orleans. Los Angeles, Norfolk and Portland explained that transients, who often are homeless, are not counted. Some of the comments from the city officials included:

Detroit: "The City of Detroit has sustained a high unemployment rate for a long period of time. As a result, a very low percentage of those who are unemployed are receiving unemployment compensation."

Kansas City: "The official unemployment rate does not reflect the growing number of person who are employed at low-wage jobs, in part-time or contract positions with no employee benefits, such as medical insurance. Such employment situations are not likely to provide long-term or adequate support to the households dependent upon such underemployed wage earners."

Minneapolis: Although the official unemployment rate for Minneapolis is between five and six percent the 1980 Census showed that one-half of the American Indian adults and 30 percent of black males were out of the work force. The official unemployment rate has little to do with the lack of employability for a substantial portion of the potential work force."

Los Angeles: "The official unemployment rate does not include the highly transient homeless and the undocumented, nor does it include the discouraged workers."

Louisville: "Unemployment is decreasing but the positions that these individuals apply for are usually part-time, and at minimum wage. And because of its declining value, the minimum wage is not sufficient."

Phoenix: "The unemployment rate reflects those individuals who are actively seeking employment. It does not reflect those who have given up hope and no longer are job seeking."

San Francisco: "The rate does not reflect the growing numbers of 'discouraged workers,' nor does it reflect numbers of persons who have left the job market because they have used up unemployment benefits."

Nashville and Saint Paul officials indicated that the official unemployment rate reflects their cities' actual unemployment situation.

Officials in 12 of the survey cities, 48 percent, reported that the actual unemployment situation in their city had improved during the last year. Those cities are Cleveland, Los Angeles, Louisville, Nashville, New York City, Philadelphia, Portland, Providence, Saint Paul, San Juan, Seattle and Washington, D.C. Nine cities (36 percent) said it remained the same; four -- Kansas City, Phoenix, Salt Lake City and San Antonio -- said it got worse. Comments about the unemployment situation by the city officials included:

Chicago: The actual unemployment situation "probably improved for persons with experience, education and job skills, but worsened for the increasing number of poor and hard-core unemployed."

Phoenix: "The continuing increase in the overall population and the seasonal influx of people during the warmer months has tended to worsen the actual unemployment situation here and throughout the southwest."

Portsmouth: "Employment may have improved slightly, however, the General Electric plant closing affected the overall statistics."

Trenton: "Employment opportunities are generally to be found in surrounding suburban areas. Linkages to these areas are still in the development stages. Urban residents with limited transportation are stranded in accessing the suburban employment opportunities."

Six cities (29 percent) expect the actual unemployment situation to improve during 1988: Cleveland, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, Providence and Seattle. Ten (45 percent) expect it to remain the same and another six expect it to worsen. Those expecting it to worsen are Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, San Francisco and Washington, D.C.

Among the city officials' comments on expectations for 1988:

Boston: "Overall Boston's unemployment situation should stay just about the same, with a potential for a slight deterioration depending on the health of the national and regional economy following the stock

market crash and subsequent nervousness in the financial markets. In general though, it should be noted that the Boston area suffers from a labor shortage in many of the service industry jobs and this is likely to reverse itself in the near future. Unfortunately, many of these jobs entail wages which may contribute to a a household income, but will not alone sustain it given the rising cost of living in the area."

Cleveland: "A number of development projects, with the expectation of significant job creation, are expected to begin or be completed in 1988."

New Orleans: "The convention center expansion, the continuation of the Mississippi River Bridge construction, the aquarium, and the approved municipal bonds all create construction jobs. The convention center and the aquarium will add to the service-related jobs. If the city is awarded the NASA contract, the employment rate will increase, but the skilled workers required for the Michoud Plant will probably move into the city from other parts of the country. Other projects underway will provide tourism, retail and service jobs."

Portsmouth: "Unless defense spending is cut, which may negatively affect the unemployment figures, the unemployment rate will probably remain the same."

Providence: "The planned development for retail shopping and the continued growth of service industries should provide increased employment opportunities, if there is no turn down in the economy."

Los Angeles: "The unemployment situation would worsen in the event of a recession."

Phoenix: "Labor market demand for skilled and experienced workers in the high technology industries is expected to worsen the unemployment situation during 1988 for the homeless and the poor."

Saint Paul: "The performance of the national economy during 1988 will play a large role in determining our unemployment rate."

San Francisco: "As the size of the unemployed labor force increases, there will be greater competition for jobs. There is no anticipated improvement for the marginally employed."

THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Officials in 16 of the survey cities (64 percent) reported that their city has benefited from the national economic recovery. Nine cities said their city had not benefited from the recovery. In contrast, officials in 20 of the survey cities -- 81 percent -- said that the economic recovery has not helped hungry, homeless or other poor people in their city. In the five cities where the economic recovery has helped the poor, that help has often been indirect, through increased charitable giving and availability of services.

While many of the cities reported that they have benefited from the national economic recovery, they explained how the hungry, homeless and other poor people have not:

Boston: "The national recovery has had little impact on those in need in the city -- as Boston and the region have been on an economic roll for some time. The local economic boom has, however, been felt by the poor. While the opportunity for employment has never been better, the challenge confronting Boston is to help those at the bottom of the economic ladder take their first few steps up while coping with the wild escalation in costs associated with basic needs for housing, food, clothing. The economic health of Boston continues to squeeze those at the bottom, making the goal of self-sufficiency increasingly illusive for many of Boston's families."

Philadelphia: "The chronically unemployed are not affected. The access to affordable housing has worsened. More persons are in shelter each day."

Portland: "The 'economic recovery' appears to have helped the middle income, employed person and to have some impact on those workers who recently were unemployed. They are finding other work. However, it appears to have no impact on the very poor in the city. The demand for hunger and homeless programs has increased. There visibly are more homeless people on the streets. Social service providers feel that there has been no economic recovery for the homeless or marginal people they work with. In fact, providing agencies question whether there has been much overall recovery at all."

Providence: "The economic recovery has not reached the poor because of the rise in the cost of housing. They've been unable to participate in the economic upturn. Any increases have been offset by high housing costs, and there are many low-paying jobs."

San Francisco: "Generally the business climate has improved, however this improvement has not been experienced by all segments of the population, particularly the poor, hungry, homeless or unemployed. Their situation has seriously deteriorated over the past two to three years; for them the gap is widening."

Trenton: "The economic recovery is currently reshaping the urban area. Neighborhoods and development areas are being demolished for renewal projects aimed at middle and upper-income populations. In fact, due to this, housing for low-income people has been reduced, and little or no federal funding is available to construct new, affordable housing projects."

Several of the cities which indicated that neither their city nor the hungry, homeless or other poor people in the city have benefited from the economic recovery described their problems:

Kansas City: "Economic growth in Kansas City is expected to increase by 2.5 percent in 1987, which is about the same as in 1986. This slow rate is the result of tax law changes which will inhibit business

expansion. Consumer spending is expected to be slow, due to high debt levels and high prices. Thus, the national 'economic recovery' is not predicted to have a particularly favorable impact on the local economy in 1987. The poor in general have not been favorably impacted by local and national policies designed to treat the symptoms of their poverty. A major national thrust toward addressing the causes of poverty is no longer just a good idea; it is the only way this battle can be won."

Louisville: "The national recovery is a myth for many. We see less unemployment, but the positions are usually part-time without benefits....Many families cannot meet their basic needs on their salary. That is why it is so very important that supportive services such as affordable housing, health care and child care be provided until they reach a salary level that meets their basic needs."

New Orleans: "The inability of the state to have an adequate tax base has meant that services are linked to the price of oil. We provided government service to residents with oil-related funds, which disappeared with the oil industry collapse. The dependence of the state on oil, the city on state and federal revenues, and health and social service agencies on these same sources has meant that resources continue to be scarce for the poor of the city."

Phoenix: "There hasn't been any noticeable or verifiable benefit from the nation's overall economic recovery in the Phoenix area, particularly as it relates to the depressed copper industry in Arizona. There hasn't been any significant increase in employment or economic opportunities for the homeless or other poor people."

San Antonio: "San Antonio has attracted much new industry; however, the city is also growing at a fast rate. The net increase of new jobs has not kept pace with the numbers of persons in the work force. There have been many programs that have been initiated or expanded to address the problems of the needy in recent years. However, budget deficits at federal, state and local levels have resulted in the same funding or reduction in funding for these programs at a time when the numbers of needy and poor persons are increasing."

Seattle: "The needs for stabilization are so severe and rooted in long-term change that the economic recovery has not positively impacted those who need long-term, substantial changes in their lives to break the cycle of homelessness."

Five cities reported that the economic recovery has helped the hungry, homeless and other poor people. Three explained this in terms of increased services and assistance:

Minneapolis: "Rent credits, which were cut, will be restored because of increasing tax revenues. Money allocated to homeless programs is growing."

Nashville: "There are many programs for homeless and poor people, including those operated by local government and charitable organizations. We feel that these programs might not have the funding avail-

able if we did not have the degree of prosperity which we have in this area."

San Juan: Some categories of federal funds were used to help the San Juan homeless population by providing food, clothing, shelter."

Two cities cited some small gains for the poor. In Portsmouth, "new jobs have been created, however, the overall unemployment rate has not decreased significantly." Saint Paul officials said: "The economic recovery has probably helped some of the marginally poor in our city, who have benefited to a certain extent. However, it is not a case of 'a rising tide lifting all boats.' Many of the hard core impoverished are insulated from a general economic upturn and will not see any benefits without government assistance."

CITY DATA ON ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

CITY	POVERTY IN 1987	UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN 1987	UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN 1988	ECONOMIC RECOVERY HELPED CITY	ECONOMIC RECOVERY HELPED POOR
BOSTON	increased	same	same	yes	no
CHARLESTON	same	same	same	no	no
CHICAGO	increased	same	same	no	no
CLEVELAND	increased	improved	improve	na	na
DETROIT	increased	same	worsen	no	no
KANSAS CITY	increased	worsened	worsen	yes	no
LOS ANGELES	increased	improved	worsen	yes	no
LOUISVILLE	increased	improved	improve	no	no
MINNEAPOLIS	same	same	same	yes	yes
NASHVILLE	increased	improved	improve	yes	yes
NEW ORLEANS	increased	improved	improve	yes	yes
NEW YORK CITY	na	improved	na	yes	no
NORFOLK	increased	na	na	yes	no
PHILADELPHIA	decreased	improved	same	yes	no
PHOENIX	increased	worsened	worsen	no	no
PORTLAND	increased	improved	same	yes	no
PORTSMOUTH	same	same	same	yes	yes
PROVIDENCE	increased	improved	improve	yes	no
SAINT PAUL	same	improved	na	yes	yes
SALT LAKE CITY	increased	worsened	worsen	no	no
SAN ANTONIO	same	worsened	na	no	no
SAN FRANCISCO	increased	same	worsen	yes	no
SAN JUAN	increased	improved	same	yes	yes
SEATTLE	increased	improved	improve	yes	no
TRENTON	increased	same	same	no	no
WASHINGTON, DC	same	improved	same	na	no

APPENDIX

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SURVEY CITIES

CITY	POPULATION	1979 POVERTY RATE	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE SEPTEMBER 1986	SEPTEMBER 1987
Boston	560,847	20.0%	5.1%	3.4%
Charleston	69,510	21.8	4.3	3.9
Chicago	2,997,155	20.3	9.6	7.3
Cleveland	558,869	22.1	12.2	7.8
Detroit	1,138,717	21.9	12.0	11.1
Kansas City, MO	445,222	13.2	5.2	6.2
Los Angeles	3,022,247	16.4	8.4	6.7
Louisville	293,531	19.3	6.6	6.5
Minneapolis	369,161	13.5	4.0	4.8
Nashville	455,252	12.6	4.3	3.9
New Orleans	564,561	26.4	11.9	9.3
New York City	7,086,096	20.0	6.6	4.5
Norfolk	266,874	20.7	4.7	4.5
Philadelphia	1,665,382	20.6	7.1	6.0
Phoenix	824,230	11.1	5.9	4.9
Portland, OR	367,530	13.0	8.3	6.1
Portsmouth, VA	105,807	19.2	7.4	6.2
Providence	155,717	20.4	4.1	3.6
Saint Paul	270,443	10.9	4.1	5.0
Salt Lake City	163,859	14.2	5.4	5.7
San Antonio	819,021	20.9	8.2	8.3
San Francisco	691,637	13.7	5.0	4.5
San Juan	522,700	47.4	13.4*	12.1*
Seattle	490,077	11.2	6.7	5.7
Trenton	92,124	21.2	6.6	6.0
Washington, D.C.	633,425	18.6	7.6	6.4

*Unemployment rate is for the metropolitan area.

SELECTED LOCALLY-DESIGNED HOUSING INNOVATIONS TO ASSIST LOW-INCOME PEOPLE

BOSTON

Linkage Program -- requires contributions of money or construction of housing units in exchange for development rights.

Inclusionary Housing Policy -- encourages a 10 percent set-aside of units in new housing developments for low- and moderate-income families.

Tenant Protections -- protections against unreasonable rent increases and evictions; proposal pending to protect against condominium conversions.

Re-Use of City-Owned Properties -- set asides for neighborhood low- and moderate-income housing.

Bricklayer's and Laborer's Union Projects -- construction project involving 17 brick townhouses sold at cost (less than 50 percent of market value) through a lottery system; a second project involving 48 units is underway.

Boston Housing Partnership -- a consortium of private, community and government leaders, acting as an umbrella development organization to foster rehabilitation and expansion of affordable housing. 700 units have been renovated thus far; there are plans for another 950 units.

CHARLESTON

SRO HOUSING -- 60 to 70 units

CHICAGO

Low-Income Housing Trust Fund -- provides operating subsidies for developments which house people at 50 percent or less of median income.

Chicago Housing Partnership -- not-for-profit housing developers receive project funding from private, corporate firms and equity funding from private (first mortgage) and public (second mortgage) sources. This permits affordable rent for families at 80 percent or less of median income.

CLEVELAND

The Cleveland Housing Network -- has used syndications supported by Cleveland corporations and foundations to finance dozens of rehabilitation projects in the city.

KANSAS CITY

Quality Heights -- a 40-unit, $2.2 million, development for families made possible by a public-private partnership which includes local developers, neighborhood groups and financiers. Rents will be from $180 to $290 per month.

Justin Place -- a central city, 80-unit, $5 million public-private development, with 40 percent of the units designated for low- to moderate-income persons. Rents for these units will be limited to 30 percent of income.

Mercy Housing -- purchases and rehabilitates deteriorating housing, which is then rented to low-income families.

LOS ANGELES

The Seismic Provision Program
The Large Family Program
The Single Room Occupancy Program

LOUISVILLE

Housing Authority Home Ownership Demonstration Program -- funds generated will be used to rehabilitate duplexes and four-plexes for additional ownership opportunities.

MINNEAPOLIS

Private-non profit developers build and renovate rental, cooperative and owner-occupied units with public and private subsidies.

NASHVILLE

Habitat for Humanity and SNAP Housing -- provide small scale rental and home ownership opportunities on land provided by the housing authority.

House Adoption Program -- churches obtain and upgrade housing which is then rented for less than market value.

NEW ORLEANS

Transitional Housing Programs -- allow three months for a family to prepare to absorb all living costs.

NEW YORK CITY

Mayor's $4.2 Billion Ten-Year Plan -- With $2 billion of City capital funds and private sector participation, 250,000 vacant and occupied units for homeless, low-, moderate-, and middle-income individuals and families will be produced, preserved and upgraded. The first two rehabilitation programs of the plan, the Vacant Building Program and the Construction Management Program are underway and involve the rehabilitation of vacant buildings owned and managed by the City's Housing Preservation and Development Department (HPD). In addition there will be two more rehabilitation efforts undertaken in cooperation with the Local Initiative Support Corporation and the Enterprise Foundation and a new construction program, the Affordable Housing Program.

NORFOLK

Old Huntersville Project -- through the Enterprise Foundation, houses are renovated and sold to lower income people. Volunteers provide labor and donate materials.

The Global Iron Project -- a 300-unit facility with 100 units for the poor, 100 for the working poor.

PHILADELPHIA

Family Stabilization Program -- subsidized units in apartments and houses for families in shelters.

Low-Demand Housing, Subsidized Housing for the Mentally Ill -- provided at the Women of Hope, Chester Manor and the Residential Placement Center.

PHOENIX

Public Purpose Program -- apartments financed with tax exempt bonds.

PORTSMOUTH

Homestead Program -- Lower income families are able to purchase HUD and foreclosed homes for $1.00. Below market interest rate loans are available to assist homesteaders in rehabilitating their homes.

SAINT PAUL

More Than Shelter Program -- a plan for going beyond temporary shelters and providing decent, long-term, affordable housing units through a new public/private partnership to finance long-term housing needs. Activities include development of subsidized units for the working poor which rent at below market rates, development of subsidized single room occupancy units which rent at below market rates, rehabilitation of existing single room occupancy units, assessing the feasibility of developing additional transitional housing facilities, and refinancing existing transitional facilities.

SALT LAKE CITY

Elderly Housing -- 300 units developed through a non-profit cooperating authority consisting of the Salt Lake City Housing Authority, the Salt Lake City Corporation and the Housing Development Corporation.

SAN FRANCISCO

Housing for the Homeless Frail and Elderly -- renovated with HUD and state housing and community development funds.

Housing for the Homeless Mentally Ill -- renovated with HUD and state housing and community development funds.

Homeless Veterans Residential Support Services

SEATTLE

City Housing Levy -- provides housing programs for special populations and homeless families. Special populations include homeless youth, homeless single women, persons with AIDS, persons with dual disabilities, homeless veterans and elderly homeless men.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Housing Finance for the Elderly Dependent and Disabled -- will provide long-and short-term acquisition and rehabilitation funding for community-based residential facilities for persons with special housing needs who are primarily low- and moderate-income.

Distressed Properties -- tax abatement provides tax incentives to bring units on line; distressed properties program provides for improvement of properties that are occupied.

Homesteading -- home ownership opportunities for current renters to enable them to become first-time homeowners through the purchase of property that the D.C. government has a lien on. A grant for rehabilitation can be provided.

City_____

TASK FORCE ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS
INFORMATION SHEET

Please complete the following survey and return it by November 20 to:

Lilia M. Reyes
U.S. Conference of Mayors
1620 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

A report will be published based on the responses to this survey. Experience has shown that such survey reports are more effective when they include examples of individual city data. If, however, you want your city's answers to any questions held confidential, please specify those questions by number:_____

NOTE: The year for which information is requested is November 1, 1986 to October 31, 1987. It is referred to as "the last year" in the survey questions.

==========

HUNGER

1. THE DEMAND

Has the demand for emergency food assistance in your city ____increased, ____decreased or ____stayed the same during the last year? By what percentage? ____%

Has the number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance in your city ____increased, ____decreased or ____stayed the same during the last year? By what percentage? ____%

What percentage of those requesting emergency food assistance are families with children? ____%

2. THE CAPACITY

On an average day during the last year, how many unduplicated people in your city were provided with emergency food assistance? ____

Has the level of resources (e.g. funds, volunteers, food, etc.) available to emergency food assistance facilities in your city ____increased, ____decreased or ____stayed the same during the last year? By what percentage? ____
Please explain.

Are emergency food assistance facilities used for ____emergencies only or ____as a steady source of food for a long time? Please explain.

For those who receive assistance, are emergency food assistance facilities able to provide an adequate quantity of food? ____Yes ____No. Is the food provided nutritionally-balanced? ____Yes ____No. Please explain.

3. THE FUNDING

During the last year, has your city government used its funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local emergency food assistance efforts?
____Yes ____No. If yes, please check appropriate sources:
____Locally generated revenues
____State grants
____Federal grants
____Community Development Block Grant
____Community Services Block Grant
____Emergency Food and Shelter Program (FEMA)
____Other_____

4. THE UNMET NEED

Please estimate the percent of the demand for emergency food assistance in your city which goes unmet. ____%

Do emergency food assistance facilities in your city have to turn away people in need because of a lack of resources?
____Yes ____No Please explain.

5. THE CAUSES

What are the main causes of the problem of hunger in your city?

6. THE OUTLOOK

Do you expect the demand for emergency food assistance in your city to ____increase, ____decrease or ____stay the same during 1988? Please explain.

HOMELESSNESS

7. THE DEMAND

Has the demand for emergency shelter in your city ___increased, ___decreased or ___stayed the same during the last year? By what percentage? ___%

Please describe the characteristics of your city's homeless population on the following chart:

	% of Homeless Population	During the Last Year Number Increased	Number Decreased	% of Change
Families w. Children				
Single Men				
Single Women				
Unaccompanied Youth (age 18 and under)				
	100 %			
Severely Mentally Ill				
Substance Abusers				
Employed (full- or part-time)				

Comments:

8. THE CAPACITY

Did the number of shelter beds in your city ___increase, ___decrease or stay the same during the last year? By what percentage? ___%

Please show below how many unduplicated people were provided emergency shelter or transitional housing in your city on an average night during the last year:

	Emeregency Shelter	Transitional Housing
Families w. Children		
Single Adults		

On the chart on the following page, please indicate which services other than emergency shelters have been specifically established in your city to assist homeless people and, if they are available, whether they are able to meet the need:

	Available to Homeless People		If Available, Able to Meet Need	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Day Centers -- Singles (including Mentally Ill)				
Day Centers -- Families				
Child Day Care				
Health Care				
Mental Health Care				
Case Management				
Transitional Housing -- Mentally Ill				
Transitional Housing -- Families				
Housing Assistance				
Job Training				
Outreach				
Counseling				
Other (specify)				

9. THE FUNDING

Is your city government using its funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local shelters or other services specifically for homeless people? ____Yes ____No If yes, check appropriate sources:

____ Locally generated revenues
____ State grants
____ Federal grants
- ____ Community Development Block Grant
- ____ Community Services Block Grant
- ____ Emergency Food and Shelter Program (FEMA)
- ____ Other _____

Has your city received any funds or commitments of funds under the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (passed by Congress last summer)? ____Yes ____No
If yes, please indicate for what programs funds or commitments have been received.

10. THE UNMET NEED

Do emergency shelters in your city have to turn away people in need because of lack of resources? ____Yes ____No
Please explain.

Please estimate the percent of the demand for emergency shelter in your city which goes unmet. ____%

In order of need, select three of the following groups of homeless people -- families with children, single women, single men, unaccompanied minors, severely mentally ill persons, substance abusers, employed persons -- for whom emergency shelter or other needed services are particularly lacking in your city? And, identify which services are most needed by each group.

Group	Services Lacking
1.	
2.	
3.	

11. THE CAUSES

What are the main causes of the problem of homelessness in your city?

12. THE OUTLOOK

Do you expect the demand for emergency shelter in your city to ____increase, ____decrease or ____stay the same during 1988? Please explain.

HOUSING

13. THE DEMAND

During the last year did the demand for assisted housing for low-income families in your city ____increase, ____decrease or ____stay the same? By what percentage? ____%.

What is the average wait in months in your city from the time of application for assisted housing until an applicant actually receives assistance? ____months.

Has your city stopped accepting applications for assisted housing programs due to the excessive length of the waiting list? ____Yes ____No

14. THE CAPACITY

Please list and describe briefly any locally-designed housing innovations aimed at assisting low-income people which are currently underway in your city?

15. THE UNMET NEED

Please estimate the percentage of eligible low-income households in your city currently being served by assisted housing. _____%

Given the decline in federal housing assistance, will local housing programs be able to meet the housing needs of low-income households in your city in the future? ____Yes ____No. Please explain.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

16. POVERTY

Do you estimate that the number of poor people in your city ____increased, ____decreased or ____stayed the same during the last year? What are the indicators of any increase or decrease in that number?

Please describe in general terms what has happened to persons in the following groups in your city during the last year.

The New Poor

The Working Poor

The Chronic Poor

CASE EXAMPLE:
Describe the conditions faced by a real family or individual in poverty in your city? (Please change any real names.)

17. EMPLOYMENT
Does the official unemployment rate for your city reflect the actual unemployment problem? ____Yes ____No. Please explain.

Did the actual unemployment situation ____improve, ____worsen or ____stay the same in your city during the last year? Please explain.

Do you expect the actual unemployment situtation in your city to ____improve ____worsen or ____stay the same during 1988? Please explain.

18. THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Has your city benefited in general from the nation's overall economic recovery? ____Yes ____No Please explain.

Has the economic recovery helped hungry, homeless or other poor people in your city? ____Yes ____No Please explain.

==========

Person Completing Form:

Name_____

Title_____

Agency_____

Address_____

_____

Telephone (____)_____

TASK FORCE ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS

Raymond L. Flynn, Boston
Chair

Federico Pena, Denver
Vice Chair

Jerry Abramson, Louisville
Marion S. Barry, Jr., Washington, D.C.
Sidney J. Barthelemy, New Orleans
Richard Berkley, Kansas City, MO
William H. Boner, Nashville
Tom Bradley, Los Angeles
Henry Cisneros, San Antonio
J. E. "Bud" Clark, Portland
Baltasar Corrada del Rio, San Juan
Palmer DePaulis, Salt Lake City
Dianne Feinstein, San Francisco
Donald Fraser, Minneapolis
Terry Goddard, Phoenix
W. Wilson Goode, Philadelphia
Arthur J. Holland, Trenton
James W. Holley III, Portsmouth
Edward I. Koch, New York City
George Latimer, Saint Paul
Joseph A. Leafe, Norfolk
Angelo R. Martinelli, Yonkers
Joseph Paolino, Jr., Providence
Joseph P. Riley, Charleston, SC
Charles Royer, Seattle
Xavier Suarez, Miami
George V. Voinovich, Cleveland
Coleman A. Young, Detroit

1620 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006